PAUL MICHAEL KURTZ

Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan

Forschungen
zum Alten Testament
122

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

Herausgegeben von

Konrad Schmid (Zürich) · Mark S. Smith (Princeton)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen) · Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

122

Paul Michael Kurtz

Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan

The Religion of Israel in Protestant Germany, 1871–1918

Mohr Siebeck

Paul Michael Kurtz: born 1984, in Harrisburg; 1999–2003, Diploma, Dunlap High School, Illinois; 2003–2007, B. A., Harding University, in English Literature and Biblical Languages; 2007–2010, M.Div., Princeton Theological Seminary, in Hebrew Bible and Northwest Semitics; 2010–2012, Doctoral Fellow, University of Chicago; 2010–2011, Fulbright Scholar, University of Göttingen; 2012–2016, Dr. phil., University of Göttingen, in History and Religion; 2016–2017, Research Associate, University of Göttingen; since autumn 2017, Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual European Fellow, University of Cambridge, and Postdoctoral Research Associate, Queens' College, Cambridge.

ISBN 978 3-16-155496-4 / eISBN 978-3-16-155497-1
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-155497-1
ISSN 0940-4155 / eISSN 2568-8359 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2018 by Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

To my mother and my father
for all they've done for me, known and unknown

… history itself is in many respects the most undisciplined of disciplines.

– George W. Stocking, Jr.[1]

Methods are dictated by theory – not the other way around.

– Bernard E. Harcourt[2]

In our time there is a great danger that those who talk most readily about historians and scholars may not know too much about history and scholarship.

– Arnaldo Momigliano[3]

"Classic." A book which people praise and don't read.

– Mark Twain[4]

---

[1] George W. Stocking, Jr., "On the Limits of 'Presentism' and 'Historicism' in the Historiography of the Behavioral Sciences," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 1, no. 3 (1965): 211–18, at 211 [repr. in idem, *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 1–12].

[2] Bernard E. Harcourt, "On the American Paradox of *Laissez Faire* and Mass Incarceration," *Harvard Law Review* 125, no. 54 (2012): 54–68, at 64.

[3] Arnaldo Momigliano, "Introduction," *History and Theory* 21, no. 4, Beiheft 21: *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1982): 1–2, at 1.

[4] Samuel L. Clemens (Mark Twain), *Following the Equator: A Journey Around the World* (Hartford: The American Publishing Company, 1897), 241 (ch. 25, citing *Pudd'nhead Wilson's New Calendar*).

Acknowledgements

Like so many Americans a century before me, I travelled to Germany in pursuit of higher learning. In addition to the long, frayed, and mostly faded threads of family heritage, more conscious ties to a mythic, almost mystic, intellectual tradition drew my imagination to the Continent at formative points in my education. From the emphasis placed upon the history of Germany in secondary school through my first encounter with Hebrew, which introduced the aphorism of German as "the most important Semitic language" (given all the reference works composed in that vernacular), to advanced training in biblical studies and ancient history, where, as in so many other fields, nineteenth-century germanophones did much to shape the modern discipline, a *je ne sais quoi* – or rather *das gewisse Etwas* – consistently attracted my attention and my curiosity to the German-speaking lands of Europe. As I learned from German masters of my own age, I learned much about those of previous ones, in places many of them had once inhabited themselves. Many of the stories in this old history, I concluded, needed to be told anew – and to be told in English. So it was that *Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan* came to be.

This book has a rather complicated history. But in fitting with the tidier, more streamlined, even teleological accounts more customary for such front matter, I can at least declare it constitutes a revised version of my doctoral dissertation, submitted to the University of Göttingen, through the Department of Medieval and Modern History, in 2016, and examined by Rebekka Habermas, Dirk Schumann, and Hermann Spieckermann. Although the lines of inquiry herein first began to form during my postgraduate study at Princeton Theological Seminary, they really consolidated during the research year that followed – funded by the Fulbright Program and conducted at Göttingen – which presented me with the luxury of time and space to read widely and think deeply about why scholars do what they do the way that they do. Such preoccupations stuck with me as I returned to the States, to the University of Chicago, and ultimately drew me back to Göttingen, where I found unspeakable support in devoted teachers, loyal mentors, and trusted friends for my doctoral undertakings. This project also took me to Mainz, Ghent, and Erfurt in official capacities. Some of the most productive labor came through working holidays in locales all differently inspiriting, from Uig to Utrecht, from Brussels to Berlin, from Osnabrück to Dunlap. Various portions of this research were presented in the United States and Germany, in

Austria and Sweden, in England and Estonia, in Switzerland and Belgium, where I auspiciously encountered a wealth of engaged interlocutors from a rich diversity of scholarly traditions.

As for the intellectual formation that underlies this project, I have profited immensely from any number of others – which does not make them culpable, however, for its deficiencies (or mine). Before the whole doctorate thing even got going to begin with, I benefited tremendously from admirable mentors. Jeremy Hutton generously gave an overambitious neophyte grounding, focus, and opportunity. Choon-Leong Seow taught me how there is always more to ask and always more to know, especially in the history of interpretation. Chip Dobbs-Allsopp enlightened me, most of all, in the art and ethics of scholarship. Kate "The Great" Skrebutenas also schooled me in the craft of hunting for materials that simply do not want to be found. Since I first began in Göttingen, Nathan MacDonald has been both a faithful advocate and a true advisor. Rebekka Habermas has, from our initial interaction onward, shown me exceptional openness, and she both usefully and gently pressed me to look beyond the tiny world of olden academic discourse. Suzanne Marchand went from being an intellectual heroine confined to the world of printed books and articles to the personal tutor of a remedial student: her helpfulness and kindness I could only underpraise. Over the years, Bernard Geoghegan has done much to inspire my work, through the questions he asks, the way he thinks, and the stories he tells. During countless nights in one especial smokey pub in Eastern Germany, Emiliano Urciuoli drove me to think more sharply, more critically, and more politically. Many others have graciously shared their insight and their time, their advice and their support, even when they certainly had better things to do: without mentioning all, I must extend my sincere appreciation to Richard Fenn, John Fortner, Susannah Heschel, Reinhard Kratz, Annelies Lannoy, Michael Legaspi, Peter Machinist, Ken Neller, Carol Newsom, Danny Praet, Michael Stausberg, and George Williamson. Without Hermann Spieckermann, however, I would never have written a single page: for years, and even still, he has fed my mind with books and my soul with conversation, nourishing me with food and wine aplenty all the while. He is a mensch in the English sense. To him I will remain forever grateful, both professionally and personally.

For help in transforming rough ideas into polished pages, I owe many debts. I must extend my gratefulness to the editors of Forschungen zum Alten Testament for commending this project to the series and both the publisher in general and Henning Ziebritzki in particular for promoting critical work in the history of scholarship and for granting precedence to quality over haste. With an unrivaled eye for detail, Harald Samuel worked wonders on the manuscript and in the process spared me much embarrassment; Dan Pioske also read closely and ruminated deeply, which enhanced the book's design and argument; Rebecca Van Hove displayed boundless care and kindness in perusing this text in its

final (and far longer) form, in counseling improvements, and in confronting my perfectionism: to them I am deeply indebted. For their beneficent assistance in procuring sources over the years, kind thanks are due to Paul Allen, Sam Boyd, Megan Brown, Joseph Cross, Dan Pioske, Peter Porzig, Andrew Sowers, John Thames, Bob Turner, and James Walters. Finally, this book would be much less were it not for the tremendous efforts of digitization undertaken in libraries and collections across the globe.

Material provisions for this project have come from numerous sources. As I returned to Göttingen, Nathan MacDonald brought me on board his Sofja Kovalevskaja project "Early Jewish Monotheisms," which was funded by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. Liberal and reliable support – for the initial writing and then the (unplanned) rewriting – came from the chairs of Hermann Spieckermann and Reinhard Kratz. Under the aegis of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and U4 Network, I had the fortune of a research stint at Ghent University, in the Department of Philosophy and Moral Sciences. The Leibniz Institute of European History, in Mainz, supplied a visiting doctoral fellowship for concentrated writing. I very much enjoyed the dissertation fellowship at the Max Weber Center for Advanced Cultural and Social Studies, in Erfurt, where I was able to work in a rigorous, intellectually stimulating environment. All of them I acknowledge gratefully.

Successful (or at least completed) projects are, of course, far more than funding secured or crystallized ideas. Dear friends have sustained me through this project and through all the life that happened in the process. For their personal support at different stages along the way, I would like to convey my heartfelt thanks especially to Sonja Ammann, Metin Bagriacik, Catherine Bronson, Britt Caluwaerts, Nicola Camilleri, Reed Carlson, Malika Dekkiche, Jordan Dyniewski, Bernard Geoghegan, Alex Jousset, Eric Lander, Amy Meginnes, Joe Meginnes, Amanda Kay Moore, Jennifer Olson, Caitlan Reeg, Julia Rhyder, Clarisse Roche, Harald Samuel, Soren Seifi, Jonathan Soyars, Emiliano Urciuoli, Mahsa Vahdat, and James Walters. Any number of others could, and actually should, be named. More effusively, Rebecca Van Hove has been a cherished companion and a veritable wellspring of encouragement and joy. My sisters, Sarah Dufendach and Rachel Kurtz, have affectionately tried to comprehend what, exactly, their brother has been doing all these years in Europe and have shown, at crucial points, how blood can be thicker than water. But it is to my parents, Pam and Craig, that I owe my deepest gratitude of all: I dedicate this work of mine to them.

Paul Michael Kurtz Queens' College, Cambridge

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements IX

Introduction: Germany's Present, Israel's Past 1

Part One: Julius Wellhausen & The Religion of Ages Past 19

Chapter One: Wellhausen Among the Mandarins 23

1.1 The Making of a Professor: Patronage and Politics 25
1.2 A Flee(t)ing Theologian 45
1.3 An Ascetic Scholarship 57

Chapter Two: The Rise and Fall of a Hebrew Nation 65

2.1 Old Testament as Prologue 69
2.2 Prolegomena to a *Prolegomena* 77
2.3 History as Nationcraft 86
2.4 Theocracy Unbound 95
2.5 Formative Islam: A Narrative Retold 109

Chapter Three: Religion's Past: Semites, Primitives, and Ancients 123

3.1 Philological Positivism 126
3.2 Different Data, Persistent Problem, Same Solution 133
3.3 Philosophy among the Anti-Philosophical 139
3.4 More Than Mere Empiricism 147

Part Two: Hermann Gunkel & Religion through History 167

Chapter Four: Gunkel Amidst the Furor Orientalis 171

4.1 The Prehistory of an Historian 173
4.2 A *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*; or, Göttingen Inter Alia 184
4.3 Religion in the *Kaiserreich*, the *Kaiserreich* in Europe 192
4.4 German Scholarship at the *Fin de Siècle* 197

Chapter Five: The World of Ancient Israel 207
5.1 New Testament by Desire, Old Testament by Demand 209
5.2 The Finish at the Start 213
5.2.1 Binding Ancient Israel to Christianity 213
5.2.2 Embracing Sources Outside the Canon 225
5.2.3 Diffusing the Situation 232

Chapter Six: History, Not Past: The Religion of Religionsgeschichte 253
6.1 Form in Text Through Time 257
6.2 A Cause for Comparison; or, Everything's a Whole 268
6.3 Inspired Persons Past 272

Concluding Remarks: Piety Through History 285
7.1 Revelation in/as History 287
7.2 Religion Now and Then, Religion Theirs and Ours 292

Bibliography 317

Index of Names and Subjects 361

Introduction

Germany's Present, Israel's Past

In the early aughts of the twentieth century, Jerusalem, long slipping, now began to fall beneath the shadow cast by Babylon. This time, however, the scene was not the Middle East but Berlin's own Sing-Akademie, and the esteemed assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch (1850–1922), son of the famed Lutheran hebraist Franz, served as the lighting technician. Here, in 1902, Delitzsch launched a series of lectures on the Bible and Babylonia, the first two of the trio held before the German Oriental Society and in the presence of none other than the German Emperor himself, Wilhelm II (1859–1941), King of Prussia and Head of the Protestant Church in Prussia. Each more polemical than the last, the sequence considered new finds from Mesopotamia and their connection to the Old Testament. Enuma Elish and the Epic of Gilgamesh, for instance, recounted stories of flood and creation much the same as those in the book of Genesis. But Delitzsch had little interest in a showcase of the similar. Instead, he pressed for dependence and pushed the question of distinction and revelation centerstage. The prospect of a god perhaps not merely waiting in the wings but in fact leaving the theatre of history altogether caused a sensation. For a German Empire deeply steeped in biblical images, motifs, and allusions, burning questions naturally emerged. Did Moses plagiarize the Code of Hammurabi? Was Paradise lost to Babylon? Could Israel's uniqueness be regained?

As the second address became an outright altercation in what became known as the "Babel–Bible Affair," Kaiser Wilhelm was compelled to give – or, better, delegate – an answer. Inquiring minds wanted to know just what their sovereign thought. The Kaiser claimed two kinds of revelation: the one continuous, general, and widespread through humanity; the other "more religious," particular, and pinnacling in Jesus.[1] While God had revealed himself, in the first case, through such great men as Hammurabi, Moses, Abraham, Homer, Charlemagne (Charles the Great), Luther, Shakespeare, Goethe, Kant, and Wilhelm I and thereby cultivated a wholistic growth of humankind, he had done so, in the second, through the lineage of Abraham to Christ, its culmination, by way of psalmists, the

[1] The text "Babel und Bibel. Ein Handschreiben Seiner Majestät Kaiser Wilhelms des Zweiten an das Vorstandsmitglied der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft, Admiral Hollmann," dated February 15, 1903, was widely distributed and published, among other places, in *Die Grenzboten: Zeitschrift für Politik, Literatur und Kunst* 62, no. 1 (1903): 493–96, cited here, at 495. Throughout this book, all translations are the author's own, unless otherwise noted.

prophets, and Moses. Suggested by the lists themselves, this twofold sense of revelation did not conceptualize the universal and the specific as only running in parallel but rather often intersecting. Moreover, according to the monarch, the Old Testament had preserved any number of passages that betrayed a purely human, historical nature and did not ultimately constitute the inspired word of God. No matter how much any further research or future discovery might modify the understanding of the deity and his dealings, so the king, the core and content of the Bible would forever stay the same. "Never was religion a result of science (*Wissenschaft*)," he concluded, "but an outpouring of the person's heart and being from his communion with God."[2]

These results of science, however, had clearly troubled the hearts of many Germans. Scholarship had thrown tenebrous shades of doubt upon the story told in the Bible and, by extension, its authority not only on the record of the ancient past but also for the present world. Such strikes against this textual foundation further risked destabilizing dominant superstructures of church and state that had rested on the holy scriptures. As one especially shrewd analysis has argued, the *Babel-Bibel-Streit* triggered in Wilhelmine Germany an equivalent to the Scopes Trial of North America, where "the long-standing contest between science and religion for social and intellectual hegemony came most forcefully into public view."[3] The stakes were high, the peril acute, precisely because of a long perceived connection, geographically, between Western Asia and Europe and, temporally, between antiquity and modernity: Christianity, and the German Protestant kind in particular, bore the torch of Israel. Consecrating the Lutheran Church of the Redeemer in Jerusalem, on Reformation Day of 1898, amidst travels across the Middle East as ostentatious as they were freighted, the Kaiser had contended, only four years prior, "From Jerusalem came the light of the world, in whose radiance our German people has become great and glorious (*herrlich*)."[4] Through this Babel–Bible Affair, the Prometheus of philology had thieved the source of that light and conferred it not only on a still more ancient time but also on the very foe of Israel, namely, Babylonia.

In fact, a couple decades prior to the *Babel-Bibel-Streit*, another set of scholarly conclusions had already provoked a controversy in the public square. The challenge then, though, had originated not from outside but within – in two separate

[2] Ibid., 496.

[3] Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down From Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 225. On this dispute, see further Reinhard G. Lehmann, *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 133; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); cf. Yaacov Shavit and Mordechai Eran, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn: From Holy Scripture to the Book of Books, A History of Biblical Culture and the Battles over the Bible in Modern Judaism*, trans. Chaya Naor (Studia Judaica 38; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 193–352.

[4] Johannes Penzler, ed., *Die Reden Kaiser Wilhelms II. in den Jahren 1896–1900* (Leipzig: Reclam, n.d.), 122.

senses: through a scrutiny of the biblical texts themselves, instead of writings recently deciphered from other ancient "oriental" peoples, which had predated sacred scripture, and, secondly, through scholars of the Bible and theology, rather than experts of cognate fields. Uniting a long tradition of Christian humanism with a new historicist philology, a circle of savants had separated the Old Testament into constituent sources and proceeded to rearrange them, chronologically. These interpreters reevaluated the composition history of the Hebrew Bible and used this reassessment to reappraise the history of Israel.[5] A revision of the literature prompted a rewriting of the past. The story these scholars told of ancient Israel radically contradicted the one recounted in the Bible.

To elucidate just how revolutionary, and indeed sensational, this retelling truly was – a retelling that would become established as a cornerstone of biblical scholarship by the final decades of the nineteenth century – a brief review of that original, ancient narrative itself is first in order. As presented by the Hebrew Bible, God created the cosmos by an act of speech alone. He placed the first humans in a garden and, once they disobeyed, damned them to a life of labor and toil. When their descendants continued the trend, he resolved to start again, with a flood and Noah's family. God made a promise to Abram (soon to be Abraham) that he would found a nation and his nation would inherit a land. Thus, Abraham sired Isaac, Isaac generated Jacob, whose name was changed to Israel, and Jacob had twelve sons, who all ended up in Egypt and whose own offspring wound up slaves. Then, God called Moses to usher them across desert, sea, and mountains and into the land of Canaan, promised to their forefather. Along the way, he gave Moses a code of law for the people to uphold, which included monolatry. (Positioned at this point in the narrative, the book of Deuteronomy claims to be that code and stresses cultic centralization, subordination of the king to God's election and the law as preserved by priests, and God's promise of blessing for obedience and curses for disobedience.) They invaded Canaan, sc., Syria-Palestine, and exterminated indigenous populations. After generations of judges – heroes like Deborah, who saved the people from their foes – God granted the nation a king. Although God chose Saul at first, he swapped horses midstream and anointed David as his chosen. Once David had united a kingdom and made Jerusalem his capital, his son Solomon built a temple. Upon the death of Solomon, the kingdom then divided, Israel in the north and Judah in the south. The kings of Israel and Judah, varied in their righteousness, cycled in and out while

[5] As a note on nomenclature, Hebrew Bible constitutes a more neutral, scholarly designation for an ancient literature roughly corresponding to that of the Old Testament, a denomination standard within the Christian tradition; in general, this book refers to the Old Testament when the discussion proceeds from the perspective of Christian thought in nineteenth-century Germany and to the Hebrew Bible when the analysis offers consideration from a contemporary angle – although these two terms may well appear interchangeably at times: see further Jon D. Levenson, *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism: Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 1–32.

prophets also came and went, sometimes for the monarch, other times against. One king in particular, Josiah, discovered the long forgotten law of Moses and sought to reenact it. Ultimately, Assyria annihilated Israel, and Babylonia massacred Judah, reducing the temple to ruins, but once Persia overtook Babylonia, it permitted the people since deported to return from exile. Nehemiah and Ezra aimed to rebuild the temple, restore the code, and renew the Jewish people (i. e., those from Judah) after exile. Other prophets foretold of a coming savior who would restore the kingdom again.

As Christianity – Jewish offshoot it was – added to that tale, these texts became an Old Testament. The New one continued the narrative with Jesus, an itinerant Jewish preacher portrayed as the savior promised to his people. With a life full of righteousness and miracles in the Roman province of Judea, Jesus impressed the masses with his teaching but not the powers that be, so religious authorities convinced the Roman government to crucify him as a revolutionary. Convinced he rose from the dead, his disciples expanded the following in quantity, geography, and quality, to encompass non-Jews in addition. They expected Jesus to return and establish a kingdom for those who followed him. Thus, the New Testament ends with Jesus assuring his imminent return.

Based on highly technical analysis, the finds of "historical criticism" had wrought a new composition history for the Old Testament texts and, in consequence, occasioned a new history of Israel. The basic reconstruction asserted the so-called law of Moses had not arisen at the start of ancient Israel but at its very end – that is, at the dawn of Judaism. This division between Israel and Judaism was critical in such investigations. If the Mosaic law had, in fact, emerged only after Israel's demise – once the northern and southern kingdoms had collapsed – the story as recounted in the Old Testament then also fell to ruins. The law, in this account, had come not from God on Sinai, where it constituted a keystone in the relationship of Yahweh to his people, traveled with the Israelites into the land of Canaan, and lay at the very foundation of their political organization, but rather from Jewish priests long after the days of Moses. As opposed to the chronicle of the Old Testament, the people of Israel had morphed into a nation, formed a sense of monotheism, and developed the divine law in full only over time. Moreover, the biblical narrative, so the argument came to run, represented an idealized portrait of history conceived by later Jews, one they had projected onto the still more ancient past. Biblical history no longer corresponded to the ancient past.

The Bible therefore took a beating in but a couple decades. This hypothesis on composition history, which had already circulated among the upper echelons of international learning as early as the 1860s, gained forceful traction by the 1880s.[6] As the critical analysis of texts gave way to more synthetic histories of

[6] See John Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany* ([Philadelphia]: Fortress Press, 1984).

Israel, this retelling then disseminated from the ivory to the bell tower, which, to many churchgoers and biblereaders, seemed to sound the knell for the Old Testament's credibility on the history of Israel and even divine revelation. The lectures that Delitzsch delivered added insult to injury. Whereas internal investigations of the biblical texts themselves had called into question their claims upon the past, external explorations among other ancient peoples then raised further doubts about pretensions to uniqueness.

Amidst enthralling decipherment of long forgotten tongues, enticing correspondences of newly published texts, and thrilling excavations from across the Middle East – conveyed physically by steam and visually by photograph to a rapidly growing number of middle-class consumers – sure discoveries brought with them certain difficulties. The challenges presented by these historical inquiries converged with obstacles erected by finds in other fields of study, whether biology or psychology, be it philosophy or geology. Of no small significance, however, the line between "faith" and "science" was anything but straight and bold. An array of reconcilers and rationalizers, a multitude of defenders and mediators believed in the promises of both. Craftsmen of historiography could thus deploy such findings as a crowbar or a clamp, either to open or to close that gap which increasingly yawned between the ancient past as it had essentially happened and the story as recounted by the biblical tradition. In fact, many who had drawn such problematic conclusions numbered not among the godless but the faithful. Students of the Bible were also teachers of its history. For those who did not, on principle, object to scrutiny of the Old Testament as any other literature, *Wissenschaft* – or science – often seemed a neutral arbiter. Dissecting the biblical texts and juxtaposing them with other sources would, through the fires of historical science, purify the knowledge of God's workings in the past, and even present, of a chosen people.

Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan examines the historiography of ancient Israel in the German Empire through the prism of religion, as a structuring framework not only for the writings on the past but also for the writers of that past themselves. The investigation focuses on these two crucial moments in the history of historical writing, as internal analysis and then external comparison of the Hebrew Bible called for a new account of the past. Indeed, the history of Israel was truly contested territory in the nineteenth century, for any number of reasons: the stakes for self-understanding amongst both Jews and Christians as pretenders to its legacy, the prominent sense of such a genealogy in the dominant cultural and intellectual forces of Protestantism within the *Kaiserreich*, the sacred institutions whose authority ostensibly rested on that inheritance, the traditional ascendency of the biblical narrative for rendering the past, and the potentially destabilizing promises of scientific inquiry into the Old Testament texts. (Notably, the concern was almost exclusively ancient Israel, as opposed to modern Palestine.[7]) As Wil-

[7] On the ironies of scholars who devoted themselves to ancient Israel yet showed little inter-

liam Faulkner knew, "The past is never dead. It's not even past."[8] Furthermore, the study of this particular antique past stood at the crossroads of theology, philology, and history – polyvalent words suggesting institutional structures, disciplinary boundaries, methodological commitments, as well as interpretive guides. Scholarship on the past of ancient Israel thus converged with the shifting trends in theory and method across the human sciences; however, the nature of the topic, the sites of its exploration, and the identify of its scholars meant this realm of erudition carried implications far beyond the world of academia. Therefore, sustained examination of this specific research tradition, in all of its complexities, contradictions, and continuities, provides leverage not only on the history of scholarship, historiography, or epistemology circa 1900 but also on the wider cultural and intellectual life of modern Germany.

By exploiting the polysemy of the word "religion," this book gains purchase, then, on the study of antique Israel as it consolidated in the German-speaking lands of the long nineteenth century. The category strengthens such analysis by drawing together several different aspects constitutive of that enterprise, on both the level of reconstruction and that of reconstructors. Sacred scriptures long supplied the primary source for accessing the past. The biblical narrative told a story of the human and divine. Scholars pinned the composition history of the Old Testament literature to changes in the ancients' thinking and doing as regards a god. Academics collapsed the history of Israel as a nation with developments in that people's practical, institutional, and theoretical life with respect to the supernatural. Ritual and cult, feasts and sacrifice, astrology and cosmogony, divine law and human priests all underwent critical inquiry. Protestant frames of reference structured historical science itself. Intellectual genealogies had long connected modern Christians in Europe to ancient Semites in Asia. The lettered agents, intellectual settings, learned societies, educational contexts, cultural institutions, and political formations across the German Empire most defining for this foundational research were themselves of Protestant character. In consequence, religion, with its productive polyvalence, serves as a lens to embrace and to inspect a complex that did so much to shape the study of a past, one with stakes especially high: the material scholars inspected, the values they upheld, the conceptual space they occupied, the institutions they served, and the society they inhabited. The history of religion in modern Germany thus exerted deep effects on histories of (religion in) ancient Israel. This analysis ultimately places at center questions of the Bible and confession to understand a world where the Bible and confession were central.

---

est in the goings-on of modern Palestine and, more broadly, on the historiography of Israel as an instance of colonial knowledge, see Paul Michael Kurtz, "The Silence on the Land: Ancient Israel Versus Modern Palestine in Scientific Theology," in *Negotiating the Secular and the Religious in the German Empire: Transnational Approaches*, edited by Rebekka Habermas (New York: Berghahn Books, forthcoming 2019).

[8] William Faulkner, *Requiem for a Nun*, Act 1, Scene 3.

Interrogating this historiography of Israel in the Second Empire, *Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan* investigates to what extent, in an age of allegedly disinterested "historical science," the very enterprise of reconstructing the ancient past in general and past religion in particular – from object to approach – was shaped by liberal Protestant structures shared by dominant historians, in Prussia, from the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries. Specifically, this inquiry scrutinizes what, exactly, biblical scholars, theologians, orientalists, philologists, and ancient historians considered "religion" and "history" to be, how they sought to access these conceptual categories, and why they pursued them the way that they did. To do so, the book evaluates two representatives of two distinct approaches to understanding religion in ancient Israel: Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918), with a source criticism largely orientated towards the history of nations, and Hermann Gunkel (1862–1932), with a comparative procedure ultimately aimed at the world behind the literature. Their corpora thus embodied those aforementioned trends in accessing the past through the Old Testament, namely, the internal dissection of the biblical literature and the juxtaposition of those same texts with external materials. Wellhausen and Gunkel also played roles in still a larger story – one long told by intellectual historians – between those who had come of age at the foundation of the German Empire and those who had established themselves circa 1890. The history of these historians, then, sheds further light on perhaps the more intricate dimensions of that story while that same story, in turn, illuminates the dynamics of them and their work.

Though little known among historians of the modern period, Wellhausen and Gunkel each made lasting contributions to the fields in which he labored – from the study of antique Israel through early Judaism and primitive Christianity to formative Islam, whether the Old or New Testament literature, be it the history of religion or of the ancient Near East. They and their ideas have been cemented into the very foundation of several modern disciplines. If translations serve as any indication, these founding figures and their foundational works have, even more, achieved a high visibility in disciplinary architecture – not forgotten but remembered, even memorialized. Wellhausen has been translated into Arabic, English, Hebrew, Hungarian, Norwegian, Russian, and Turkish, with much attention granted to his ventures in the history of Islam and Judaism.[9] In the sphere of biblical scholarship, and especially among anglophones, Gunkel has exerted a special allure, with a goodly number of translations into English: his 1888 monograph on the spirit in 1979 (reprinted in 2008), his 1895 exploration of cosmogony across diffuse ancient literatures in 2006 (a thesis reconsidered in a dedicated 2013 volume), a series of essays first published between 1900 and 1928 in 2001, his third edition of the 1901 Genesis commentary in 1997, his introduction to that third edition in 1994, his 1903 foray into the *Babel-Bibel-Streit*

[9] See the entries under Wellhausen in the appended bibliography.

in 2009 (printed anew in 2011), his 1906 *Elias, Jahve und Baal* in 2014, his 1917 study of folklore in 1987 (printed again in 2015), his 1929 introduction to the Psalter in 1998, and his 1930 revision of earlier articles on the Psalms in 1967 (reissued in 1969), not to mention the numerous renderings of various books and essays already in his own time.[10] In this way, Wellhausen and Gunkel not only occupied an important place in the pasts of their own disciplines but also bear on the contemporary pursuits of their successors in the same.

Even a century later, both continue to serve as major nodes when those disciplines map their own histories. In fact, for contemporary scholarship on the Hebrew Bible, this academic duo feature frequently as archetypes, not only for specific analytical modes but also for antithetical endeavors. One biblical scholar has employed them, typically, to chart interpretive poles:

> The parameters for questions of interpretation were largely set by Wellhausen and Gunkel. Wellhausen's approach is scientific, Gunkel's artistic. Wellhausen is consistently analytical,

[10] Hermann Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul*, trans. Roy A. Harrisville and Philip A. Quanbeck, II (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); idem, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*, trans. K. William Whitney, Jr., with a foreword by Peter Machinist (Biblical Resource Series; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), cf. JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal, ed., *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's* Chaoskampf *Hypothesis* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013); idem, *Water for a Thirsty Land: Israelite Literature and Religion*, ed. and trans. K. C. Hanson (Fortress Classics in Biblical Studies; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011); idem, *Genesis*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Mercer Library of Biblical Studies; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997); idem, *The Stories of Genesis*, ed. William R. Scott, trans. John J. Scullion (Vallejo: BIBAL Press, 1994); idem, *Israel and Babylon: The Babylonian Influence on Israelite Religion*, trans. E. S. B., ed. K. C. Hanson (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2009); idem, *Elijah, Yahweh, and Baal*, trans. K. C. Hanson (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014); idem, *The Folktale in the Old Testament*, trans. Michael D. Rutter, with an introduction by John W. Rogerson (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1987) [repr. Bloomsbury Academic Collections/Biblical Studies: Historic Texts; London: Bloomsbury, 2015)]; idem, *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*, trans. J. D. Nogalski (Mercer Library of Biblical Studies; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998) [the front cover reads *An Introduction to the Psalms*]; idem, *The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction*, trans. Thomas M. Horner, with a foreword by James Muilenburg (Facet Books Biblical Series 19; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967) [mistakenly listed as the translation of an essay in Vol. 1, rather than Vol. 4, of *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*'s second edition]. Contemporary translations include, inter alia, idem, *The Legends of Genesis*, trans. W. H. Carruth (Chicago: Open Court Publishing, 1901) [repr. as *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga & History*, with an introduction by William Foxwell Albright (New York: Schocken: 1964) and (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003), with this introduction to the first edition of his Genesis commentary also being published separately in German, as *Die Sagen der Genesis*]; idem, "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament"; idem, *Israel and Babylon: The Influence of Babylon on the Religion of Israel*, trans. E. S. B. (Philadelphia: McVey, 1904); idem, "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion"; idem, *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*, trans. A. K. Dallas (New York: Macmillan, 1928); cf. also Martin J. Buss, "Gunkel, Hermann," in *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald M. McKim (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 487–91, at 490–91. Many of these publications have streamed from publication channels oriented towards a more conservative interpretation of the Bible, which merits an inquiry all its own.

Gunkel synthetic. Wellhausen aims for precision, Gunkel for suggestive nuance. Wellhausen speaks of documents whereas Gunkel treats of tradition. Wellhausen values discipline, Gunkel stresses imagination.[11]

Overly schematic or not, such an antipodal presentation reflects the way these nineteenth-century savants have functioned for their disciplinary descendants. Wellhausen and Gunkel, their personas and their publications, remain prominent fixtures in the study of Hebrew Bible and ancient Israel, where they act as benchmarks for tracking developments in the field. The legacy of Wellhausen and Gunkel has, indeed, transcended a single discipline, any one language, and even the long nineteenth century – despite their near invisibility in studies of modern history on intellectual life in the period.

This record of wide reception and function for interpretive parameters suggest dissimilarity between the place of Wellhausen and Gunkel in disciplinary memory and their standing in studies of intellectual and cultural history. Beyond the point of prominence, however, a greater inconsistency emerges in the actual assessments of these two scholars and their contributions by practitioners of those disciplines in which they themselves had toiled, on the one hand, and by modern historians, on the other – that is, those relative few who have delved into the history of biblical and theological scholarship and, rarer still, considered these men and their letters. Evaluations of Wellhausen document this discrepancy well. His confrères past and present have long celebrated, even idolized, his endeavors, specifically as an historian. While the biblical scholar Rudolf Smend (Jr.) ranks his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* and *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* among "the classic historical works of the 19th century," historian of religion Kurt Rudolph hails him "a true historian, a historian indeed of the highest caliber."[12] Wellhausen's contemporaries were equally impressed. Not only did the orientalist Enno Littmann (1875–1958) eulogize him as "one of the greatest historians of all time," but arabist Carl Heinrich Becker (1876–1933) even waxed poetic:

> The writing of history is as impossible to learn as the making of it. Statesmen and historians are born. Though historical sense is a gift from God, he does not create the historian. The

[11] Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff, *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 20.

[12] Rudolf Smend, "Julius Wellhausen, 1844–1918," in idem, *From Astruc to Zimmerli: Old Testament Scholarship in three Centuries*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 91–102, at 91; Kurt Rudolph, "Wellhausen as an Arabist," in *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, ed. Douglas A. Knight (Semeia 25; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 111–55, at 117; cf. also Lothar Perlitt, "Julius Wellhausen," in *Göttinger Gelehrte. Die Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen in Bildnissen und Würdigungen*, 2 vols., ed. Karl Arndt, Gerhard Gottschalk, and Rudolf Smend (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001), 1:268; Reinhard G. Kratz, "Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918) und die Geschichte," in *Stiftsgeschichte(n). 250 Jahre Theologisches Stift der Universität Göttingen (1765–2015),* ed. Bernd Schröder and Heiko Wojtkowiak (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 105–16, at 108.

true historian must unite the painstaking work of the carter with the art of a master builder. Historical sense must master the hard-won mass, and artistic creative power ennobles it. In this respect, Wellhausen was a genuine historian.[13]

Such sentiment still echoes throughout the hallways of departments that have a share in his scholarly heritage, reverberating with particular strength in the corridors of theological faculties and in the rooms of Old Testament scholars across German-speaking Europe. While experts in his own fields of specialism have routinely lionized Wellhausen's distinction as an historian, beyond a solitary discipline, and for an entire epoch, modern historians themselves have proved far more restrained, or maybe less invested. Suzanne Marchand hence positions Wellhausen in her "galaxy of minor figures" while Thomas Albert Howard sets him in the "hatchery of 'important lesser' theologians and biblical critics" for the nineteenth century.[14] So, too, Sabine Mangold(-Will) has contended that for all the historical questions figures like Theodor Nöldeke (1836–1930) or Wellhausen may have posed in, or even introduced to, their areas of study, such orientalists considered themselves first and foremost philologists or linguists and only then historians.[15] These incongruous estimations evince a divide in conceiving the history of scholarship between those inside and those outside the scholar's sectors of specialization.

Said dissimilitude between the portraits of Wellhausen – as an historian or philologist, as a major or minor figure – has no little to do, indeed, with the landscape drawn behind him: i. e., whether his interpreters cast the researcher within smaller spheres of specialism or against the larger intellectual background of the nineteenth century. Similar contrasts would emerge for Gunkel, and others, as well. Tellingly, one monograph on histories of Israel has opened with the striking observation:

---

[13] Enno Littmann, "Erinnerung an Julius Wellhausen," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 106 (1956): 18–22, at 20; C. H. Becker, "Julius Wellhausen," *Der Islam* 9 (1919): 95–99, at 95.

[14] Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Publications of the German Historical Institute; Washington, D. C.: German Historical Institute/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), xxx–xxxi, cf. 167 as well as idem, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism: Albrecht Dieterich, Richard Reitzenstein, and the Religious Turn in *Fin-de-Siècle* German Classical Studies," in *Out of Arcadia: Classics and Politics in Germany in the Age of Burckhardt, Nietzsche and Wilamowitz*, ed. Martin Ruehl and Ingo Gildenhard (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 79; London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Studies, University of London, 2003), 129–60, at 140; Thomas Albert Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism: W. M. L. de Wette, Jacob Burckhardt, and the Theological Origins of Nineteenth-Century Historical Consciousness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 4–5; also worth mentioning here is Howard's *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[15] Sabine Mangold, *Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft" – Die deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Pallas Athene 11; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2004), 108.

It is a fact worthy of remark that no biblical historian is included in the standard dictionaries of historians. A search of the indices will show Herbert Butterfield, famous for his *Whig Interpretation of History*, has written on the subject of biblical history. No one trained in departments of religion or in Semitic languages, however, has an entry.[16]

Such divergence in identifying these scholars and their oeuvres almost certainly evinces the way the discipline of history has itself evolved – long tied to classical as opposed to biblical antiquity (and thus more cognizant of specialists in ancient Greece and Rome), no longer bound so closely to the philological apparatus that once underwrote it, and perhaps even forgetful of its own past and the constructed nature of its boundaries. From the opposite direction, the reference to whiggish history thematizes a perspective not uncommon in accounts composed within disciplines themselves, which often tend to reduce the causality of change to veracity, to bracket context in favor of ideas, to construct narratives of progress, and to elevate specific figures and communities.

This gulf between practitioners and modern historians in the recognition of Wellhausen and Gunkel – in both the awareness of them as intellectuals and the appraisal of their undertakings – leads to the question of this monograph's own approach. Some years ago, historian Peter Novick outlined a triad of dichotomies evident in the historiography of organized knowledge and knowledge producers, wherein he contrasted internalism vs. externalism, cognitivism vs. non-cognitivism, and disciplinary histories vs. histories of disciplines.[17] These oppositions help construct a matrix to locate the ends and means of this investigation. As for the first division, internalist lines of inquiry center rather strictly on developments that occurred within a given discipline, tracking, for instance, changes in hypotheses, argumentation, and conclusions, detailing protagonists in the profession, or following the personal appointments and subject assignments of chairs, while disregarding, if not totally ignoring, their embeddedness within a surrounding environment; externalist explorations, by contrast, concern themselves with one or more dimensions of that surrounding environment in relation to such developments in the discipline. With respect the second polarity, cognitivist studies concentrate on the very substance of research, mostly

[16] Diane Banks, *Writing the History of Israel* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 438; London: T & T Clark International, 2006), 1. The claim, of course, depends on the parameters of "standard". Wellhausen does find a place – as a "German religious historian" – in Kelly Boyd, ed., *Encyclopedia of Historians & Historical Writing*, 2 vols. (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1999), 2:1290–91. His appreciation in the 1913 *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*, 1st ed. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.), composed by the British non-professional historian George Peabody Gooch, also remains exceptional not only in its very existence but also in its length. On Gooch's life and work, see C. D. Penner "G. P. Gooch as an Historian," *Historian* 3, no. 1 (1940): 97–112; W. N. Medlicott, "G. P. Gooch," *Journal of Contemporary History* 4, no. 1 (1969): 201–03; Felix E. Hirsch, "George Peabody Gooch," *Journal of Modern History* 26, no. 3 (1954): 260–71.

[17] Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 9–13.

as a rational process; non-cognitivist modes of analysis, conversely, pursue the social, political, economic, cultural, psychological, or other such factors at work in the evolution of scientific communities and their results. Concerning the third duality, already implied in the prior interpretive discrepancy around Wellhausen, disciplinary history refers to accounts created by practitioners of the discipline at issue, while histories of disciplines designate those accounts written by outside historians – a distinction between birds and ornithologists, to borrow from the novelist Saul Bellow.[18]

Written from the standpoint of a critic, not a caretaker, *Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan* integrates these perspectives, internalist and externalist, cognitivist and non-cognitivist, striving to miss neither trees nor forest. With a focus on Wellhausen and Gunkel, this investigation treats the social, biographical, and personal dimensions that did so much to cultivate such scholars, tackles the institutional machinery that made students into professionals, considers the consolidation of academic disciplines, addresses the intellectual, political, and cultural dynamics that shaped, and re-shaped, those disciplines themselves, and regards the response of researchers to the changing world around them, with all its new demands. To explain and understand the history of historiography, however, this examination proceeds in no small part from deep readings of their texts, thereby leaning more internalist, even as the interpretation of those texts draws heavily on the lives of their authors and the particular time and space they inhabited. The book untangles the arguments brought into service as writers discussed the "history" and "religion" of antiquity, interrogates the inner logic operative, disarticulates those narratives they constructed, ruminates on the very methods of accessing the past, contemplates the theories underwriting them, dissects the genesis and implications of those theories and methods themselves, and unravels both the constraints and the enabling conditions of exploring antiquity in the nineteenth century. Importantly, this inquiry eschews the frames of presentism,

[18] Cf. Zachary Leader, *The Life of Saul Bellow: To Fame and Fortune, 1915–64* (New York: Knopf, 2015), 11–12. Not infrequently, the friction does rub hard between these two perspectives. As Novick has noted, Laurence Veysey once asserted, as the history of disciplines was gaining steam, "A sociologist or philosopher may respond to outside historical inquiry surprisingly much in the same defensive spirit as the leadership of some organized religious cult. […] A sociologist writing the history of sociology remains, from the historian's point of view, an amateur, no different in principle from an untrained Mormon writing the history of Mormonism. Particularistic intellectual commitments inhibit balanced clarity of vision regarding a certain time and place, in the academic world as in any other" (Laurence Veysey, "Reappraising the Chicago School of Sociology," *Reviews in American History* 6, no. 1 [1978]: 114–19, at 114–15). More recently, and from the opposite direction, semitist Holger Gzella has, with explicit reference to Mangold's volume on the history of orientalist research, disapprovingly likened scholars writing on the subject without specialized training in the field (*fachfremd*) to "someone who would write a biography of Newton without being familiar, even in the main features, with classical mechanics" (Holger Gzella, review of *Im Halbschatten. Der Orientalist Hellmut Ritter (1892–1971)*, by Josef van Ess, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 73, no. 3–4 [2016]: 475–82, at 476).

hoping to avoid particularistic commitments in the contemporary study of ancient Israel: it seeks neither to determine which conclusions or procedures were "right," "wrong," or "better" nor to settle disputes between schools and legatees, then and now. This analysis, moreover, brackets "truth" as an explanation for the course of intellectual developments, from the formulation of questions through the conception of hypotheses to the acceptance of results. Further still, to overcome interpretive gaps amongst accounts in the modern history of theological and philological scholarship, the assessment seeks to build a bridge between specialized, internal viewpoints and broader, external vantages, for historians, often by necessity, avail themselves of the advantages afforded by detailed knowledge of the material at issue while practitioners far less frequently exploit the insights and innovations of greater cultural and intellectual history. Finally, the monograph aims to counterbalance the commanding trends of hagiography and demonography in disciplinary history, which vitiate many representations of Wellhausen and Gunkel in particular and of historical writings on ancient Israel in general. Rather than celebrate achievements, affirm conclusions, or repudiate procedures, this work places front and center the contingencies of historiography – its theories, its values, its methods.

As it scrutinizes these works and workers on the history of Israel, the book advances a series of larger arguments on historiography in modern Germany – some of them quite subtle, others more emphatic. One contention centers on more recent discussions of the secular and the religious. In line with noted anthropologist Talal Asad, historians of the Germanies have historicized such categories as sacred and profane, religious and secular, religion and superstition, analyzing their construction, their instability, and their transformation.[19] Anthony La Vopa has thus discerned "the reformulation of the sacred within a desacralized discourse," finding in the figure of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814) discernible moments in "the secularization of Lutheranism," while Rebekka Habermas has traced a "Protestantization of the national" specifically in the *Kaiserreich*, where "the Protestant church became identified with the German state and thereby became part of the secular realm."[20] So, too, George William-

[19] Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003); cf. idem, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reason of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993). For a recent assessment of religious phenomena and the remit of intellectual history, see Sarah Shortall, "Lost in Translation: Religion and the Writing of History," *Modern Intellectual History* 13, no. 1 (2016): 273–86.

[20] Anthony J. La Vopa, *Fichte: The Self and the Calling of Philosophy, 1762–1799* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 13; Rebekka Habermas, "Piety, Power, and Powerlessness: Religion and Religious Groups in Germany, 1870–1945," in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern German History 6*, ed. Helmut Walser Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 453–80, at 459; see further idem, "Weibliche Religiosität – oder: Von der Fragilität bürgerlicher Identitäten," in *Wege zur Geschichte des Bürgertums. Vierzehn Beiträge*, ed. Klaus Tenfelde and Hans-Ulrich Wehler (Bürgertum: Beiträge zur europäischen Gesellschaftsgeschichte 8;

son has demonstrated "the degree to which the supposedly secular realms of nineteenth-century art and scholarship were infused with the rhetoric, narratives, and assumptions of Christian theology."[21] More and more in the German Empire, such discourse clearly separated the secular and the religious even as the understanding of these categories changed, with the Protestant encoded as the secular itself. These renderings also impacted on definitions of the rational, the modern, and the scientific – especially with respect to biblical criticism and its reconstructions of the religious and the secular in the ancient world.

Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan describes then, in a similar way, a Protestantization of the past. Confessional modalities structured not only the very apparatus of *Wissenschaft* but also the questions and objects, the theories and methods operative in the study of history. On the level of academic labor, epistemologies of liberal Protestantism were coded as neutral and scientific. Critical inquiry into the biblical literature, as any other text, promised to eliminate the detritus of the past and to recover an authentic historical core, one that could reveal a deeper moral truth and even suggest the immanence of the divine in empirical cause and effect. Such a framework resonates with Lucian Hölscher's description of civil religiosity becoming a culture of reflection, which "unfolded by turning itself critically and in a constantly self-historicizing way against the religious tradition from which it had arisen" – a conscious return to historical essence, for the purpose of cultural progress, that understood itself, fundamentally, as "urprotestant."[22] Historical undertakings were, in fact, assumed by dominant forces to serve theology, as a way of knowing God, and even to edify the church. On the level of scholarly productions, Protestant representations of the past came to be marked as sci-

---

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 125–48; idem, "Rituale des Gefühls. Die Frömmigkeit des protestantischen Bürgertums," in *Der bürgerliche Wertehimmel. Innenansichten des 19. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Manfred Hettling and Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 169–91.

[21] George S. Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 4; cf. also Ryan Coyne, *Heidegger's Confessions: The Remains of Saint Augustine in* Being and Time *& Beyond* (Religion and Postmodernism; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015). The conclusions of Jonathan Z. Smith should be recalled: "The pursuit of the origins of the question of Christian origins takes us back, persistently, to the same point: Protestant anti-Catholic apologetics. […] The same presuppositions, the same rhetorical tactics, indeed, in the main, the very same data exhibited in these early efforts underlie much of our present-day research, with one important alteration, that the characteristics attributed to 'Popery', by the Reformation and post-Reformation controversialists, have been transferred, wholesale, to the religions of Late Antiquity" (idem, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* [Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 14, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990], 34).

[22] Lucian Hölscher, "Bürgerliche Religiosität im protestantischen Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Religion und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Wolfgang Schieder (Industrielle Welt 54; Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1993), 191–215, at 209; see further idem, *Geschichte der protestantischen Frömmigkeit in Deutschland* (Munich: Beck, 2005).

entific. Notwithstanding their modifications to the biblical material, the "new" histories of Israel ultimately endorsed that well-established genealogy which ran from a Semitic people of the first millennium BCE through the formative period of Christianity to modern Protestantism, baptizing in the waters of philological science a specific narrative long construed in Christian accounts of history. Just as the narrated past came to assume features masculine, political, and statist, so also the religion of antiquity – in its idealized forms – became inward, individual, and ethical. These more pietistic qualities contrasted such themes as the affirmation of doctrine, belief in the supernatural, ritual in worship, and uniformity of the collective, which the Protestant imagination tended to identify, negatively, with Catholicism.[23] Taught and examined at public universities and schools to an expanding middle class by employees of an increasingly centralized state, the subjects introduced, the data prioritized, the problems posed, the strategies employed, and the interpretations wrought thus reinforced the equation of Protestant faith and secular science. The historical was mapped onto the theological.

This study further asserts the true tenacity of these structures. Examining the contours of historiography produced by Wellhausen and Gunkel, the book explores the lines of continuity and discontinuity amidst the crisis of historicism. At the turn of the twentieth century, debate intensified over what, precisely, counted as good or proper history. Such dispute surrounded the suitable sources for reconstructing the past, the best means of interpreting those sources, the appropriate objects of analysis, the purpose of historical inquiry itself, and the ultimate audience and beneficiaries of these undertakings. This discourse also showed a move in the rationalization of higher learning, whether research on antiquity proceeded owing to its own intrinsic value or by dint of a function relevant to, if not essential for, society as a whole. The scholars scrutinized herein document some of the answers submitted to these burning questions – often clashing, even polemical answers delivered from notably different perspectives. Nevertheless, a Protestantized past held strong despite these massive changes in the theorization and the methodization of writing on antiquity. Even as the aircraft of historiography encountered turbulence – bumping and shuddering in those winds that indicated destabilization in society and scholarship alike – the uniqueness of ancient Israel, the bond of Christianity to prophecy, the supremacy of Jesus, the priority of canonical texts, the interior locus of religion, and the primacy of private, individual experience were all contents that did not shift in flight, piloted as it was by Protestants of at least the cultural kind and guided by maps largely sketched by the thought and practices of Christian humanism. The stability of these theological trajectories in spite of the modifications driven by

[23] Cf. Michael B. Gross, *The War Against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany; Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004), esp. 99–106.

innovations in the theory and method of historicist research hints at the ability of disciplines to discipline: to absorb, adapt, and integrate once threatening contingents, claiming constancy all the while.

The endeavor and approach so delineated, a few words are still in order as to audience. *Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan* should appeal to those with interest in biblical criticism, theology, philology, history, and orientalist research during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, especially in their manifestations across German-speaking Europe. Given its subject matter, this investigation entertains the hopefully reasonable expectation of attracting specialists in biblical studies, classics, the ancient Near East, the history of religion, and theology. The book aims equally, if not more, to engage modern cultural and intellectual histories, both benefiting from and contributing to the momentum, gained in recent years, for work on the history of biblical, classical, theological, and orientalist scholarship in the late modern period. With its emphasis on the entanglement of the past and present, its stress on the pull of antiquity, its accent on the prominence of religious concerns, and its concentration on the origins of modern disciplines as well as its weight on Wellhausen and Gunkel, its focus on the history of Israel, and its attention to biblical literature, the work, then, hopes to find a readership among historians and practitioners alike. In its attempt to understand the driving forces behind the historiography of ancient Israel in modern Germany, this monograph essays to synergize the strengths of their schematized perspectives, interrogating the production of knowledge on the past with a breadth afforded by the larger history of the human sciences and with a depth delivered by sustained analysis of specific questions, campaigns, and careers. The undertaking constitutes, first and foremost, one of intellectual history, with special interest in the history of scholarship, the history of knowledge, and the history of historiography. Its principal interest is therefore in the past. However, since specific values, certain categories, particular assumptions, and set procedures all generate distinct forms of knowledge, this excavation of historiographic and interpretive foundations may, one hopes, help contemporary writers of history and interpreters of texts reflect on the theories and methods naturalized in their own explorations of the ancient past.

Concerning its design, this inquiry progresses chronologically, thereby tracking the generational shift from liberalism to neoromanticism as embodied by Wellhausen and Gunkel. Structurally, the book consists of two principal parts, each devoted to a figure, and comprises a set of parallel chapters. The first chapter, in both cases, considers how biographical, cultural, and social factors helped shape the scholar's professional development. The second chapter examines how the study of ancient Israel fit within the larger trajectory of his academic work. The third chapter scrutinizes how the historian sought to access, understand, and reconstruct the past. Rather than a summary, the concluding chapter then interrogates the continuities in their historiography through an integrated com-

parison, measuring the contours in their conceptions of history and religion despite substantial divergence at times. Each division, in fact each chapter, can therefore stand alone, but together they construct a whole on the religion of Israel in Protestant Germany – hopefully one greater than the sum of its parts.

Part One

Julius Wellhausen & The Religion of Ages Past

> Biblical criticism, however, has not, in general, developed under the influence of philosophical ideas. […] Philosophy … does not precede but follows in that she seeks to examine and systematize what she herself has not produced.[1]

In a letter from 1880, Julius Wellhausen described the thematic winds in the sails of his historiography. Referring to recent efforts in the study of formative Islam, the German semitist confessed to his Scottish confidant and confrère William Robertson Smith (1846–1894), "The interesting thing for me is not the theological, of course, but rather the religio-political, the foundation of the state in Medina through Islam."[2] He went on to write, "I don't give a damn about monotheism and the like; for such things I have no understanding; I have no philosophical vein." Though only incidental, these remarks reveal much of his own predilections. The orientalist concerned himself less with matters of practice or belief than of politics and religion in their synergy and conflict. Be it ancient Israel, early Judaism, primitive Christianity, or formative Islam, all his objects of inquiry saw their literatures succumb to philological dissection in an attempt to establish whence they came and how a previous age was distorted by subsequent, interested parties. The multiplex work of Wellhausen was, in sum, extraction.

Part One begins with a chapter devoted to Wellhausen the man. This first chapter thus surveys the biographical, cultural, and social factors most immediately relevant to his academic practice and production. Beyond the standard entries published in subject dictionaries, handbooks, and encyclopedias, the tributes composed by friends and colleagues, and the efforts of one Wellhausen maven in particular – namely, Rudolf Smend (Jr.) – no full biography has yet to see the light of day. A 28-page obituary, with appendices, written by Eduard Schwartz (1858–1940) still remains the best account to date, whose initial printing also provided

---

[1] Julius Wellhausen, "Strauß' *Leben Jesu*," *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* (Munich) 45 (March 24, 1908): 353–54, at 354.

[2] Wellhausen to William Robertson Smith, August 18, 1880, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, ed. Rudolf Smend, Peter Porzig, and Reinhard Müller (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 76.

the curriculum vitae Wellhausen had submitted for a post in Göttingen.[3] Thanks to a splendid edition of his extant correspondence, however, crucial material for such an endeavor now lies at the ready. This new resource provides a deeper if fractured and coincidental avenue into Wellhausen's life and work. Although the true biographical task lies for another to assume, this chapter expends some modest efforts to historicize the historian as he sought to navigate institutional structures, political dynamics, and cultural debates. This assessment both broadens and deepens the evaluation of his work. By foregrounding this background, chapter one seeks to complement the usual kind of commentary on Wellhausen, which often tends to emphasize a product over producer and production.

After a sketch of his life and times, chapter two turns to the contents of his corpus, shifting from questions of whom to those of what. The inquiry thus progresses from contextualizing the scholar and his work within the broader human sciences to positioning his particular work on ancient Israel within his wider corpus. Through the course of his career, Wellhausen transitioned from Hebrew and Old Testament to early Islam and Arabic before concluding with New Testament research, but regardless of their content or institutional home of their composition, the histories Wellhausen wrote bore a striking similarity. Indeed, his historiography as a whole followed complex interactions "of religious and political forces, both in their collaboration and in their conflicts," to use a shrewd description from Arnaldo Momigliano.[4] Indeed, the clash and collaboration of religion and politics – as reflected in literature – boasted pride of place.

Chapter three examines the underlying epistemology in the historical work of Wellhausen. While the narratives he told looked an awful lot alike, his means of reconstructing them were very near the same. From inquiry into the whom and then inspection of the what, the analysis proceeds to an exploration of the how. Wellhausen constructed his accounts of the ancient world through the study of composition history. More specifically, he scrutinized foundational or canonical texts to find layers of writing within them – distinguishing early from late, identifying biases of writers – and to transform this literary sequence into a history of tradition. This information could then serve as raw material for reconstruction of the past. No matter the source itself – its chronology or content, its geography or language – Wellhausen conducted the same operation. But rather than any lone empiricism, this philologist had a distinct conception of history, characterized by order, progress, and meaning. History, for Wellhausen, could don almost mystical qualities, becoming a quasi-god. This understanding of history as force ultimately governed his study of literature and reconstruction of

[3] For an inventory of these obituaries, see Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 838. This edition of his correspondence reprints the curriculum vitae, among other valuable sources.

[4] Arnaldo Momigliano, "Religious History Without Frontiers: J. Wellhausen, U. Wilamowitz, and E. Schwartz," *History and Theory* 21, no. 4, Beiheft 21: *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1982): 49–62, at 53.

the past. However, neither his explicit method nor his implicit theory belonged to him alone. Instead, he shared the ends and means of accessing the past with other practitioners of historical research across the human sciences. With his work on ancient Israel, Wellhausen gave a profane reading of sacred scripture.

Chapter One

Wellhausen Among the Mandarins

Versing the lore of the rat-catcher, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832) lyricized, "Sometimes the bard so full of cheer / As a child-catcher will appear, / Who e'en the wildest captive brings, / Whene'er his golden tales he sings."[1] Better known in English as the Pied Piper, the story tells of a traveler clad in particolored costume whose fluted song lures to their deaths in the River Weser the rats overrunning the city of Hamelin and who, upon dispute of payment with the burghers, spirits their children away by the same means into a distant land, never to be seen again. Born in that same Hamelin more than half a millennium later, Julius Wellhausen enticed the theological hearts and minds of many a *Bildungsbürger* by the mellifluent words of his silver tongue – or rather quill.[2] "No Old Testament scholar," Smend asserts, "has been read with so much admiration, and none has been so bitterly opposed."[3] The orientalist had decoupled the past of ancient Israel from the story retailed in the Bible. Rather than some long hard fall from grace since the Garden of Eden, he retold the thrilling history of a Hebrew people who had built their institutions only gradually by their own sweat and blood. His interpreters may diverge in their precise points of comparison – whether he produced the innovative intervention of a Charles Darwin (1809–1882) or the grand synthesis of a Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913) – but they converge in describing an historiographical force to be reckoned with.[4] He had an

---

[1] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, "The Rat-Catcher," in *The Poems of Goethe: Translated in the Original Metres. With A Sketch of Goethe's Life*, ed. and trans. Edgar Alfred Bowring (London: Parker and Son, 1853), 159–60, at 159.

[2] Wellhausen was born on May 17, 1844. The Society of Biblical Literature recorded his death as January 10, 1918 (Henry J. Cadbury, "Proceedings, December, 1918," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 38, no. 3/4 [1919]: i–xiii, at iii), the actual date of his burial, although Morris Jastrow, Jr., published it as April of 1918 (idem, "The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis," *The Nation* 108, no. 2794 [January 18, 1919], 103) and April of 1917 (idem, "Semitic Languages and Literatures," in *The American Yearbook: A Record of Events and Progress, 1919*, ed. Francis G. Wickware [New York: Appleton, 1920], 793). On account of the ongoing war, news of Wellhausen's death came late to North America (cf. Franklin Edgerton, "Report of the Corresponding Secretary," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 39 [1919]: 130–33, at 132).

[3] Smend, "Julius Wellhausen," in idem, *From Astruc to Zimmerli*, 91.

[4] Cf. Herbert F. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 11–12; Craig Brandist, "Semantic palaeontology and the passage from myth to science and poetry: the work of Izrail' Frank-Kamentskij (1880–1937)," *Studies in Eastern European Thought* 63, no. 1 (2011): 43–61, at 46.

even wider repertoire, however. Wellhausen also sang the songs of other peoples at other times, recounting the early histories of Islam and Christianity. Here, too, he has found many a follower.

Wellhausen's greatest claim to fame centered on a sequence of events of controvertible connection. Having published a controversial volume on the history of Israel – one that questioned the fundamental narrative told by the Old Testament – he renounced his chair in the faculty of theology together with a research concentration in Hebrew and the Old Testament and accepted, instead, a post of lower rank in the faculty of arts at a different university altogether, which allowed him to focus on Arabic and formative Islam. For some, he was a martyr – slaughtered professionally for his steadfast faith in the true promises of biblical scholarship; for others, he was guilty of the selfsame sins as Socrates: for corrupting the youth with his teaching and for not believing in the gods of the fathers but rather having a daemon of his own. But as Marchand has profiled the man, "… we should not think of Wellhausen as a kind of Mephistophelian, nay-saying *agent provocateur* – for he did believe quite ardently in something. Julius Wellhausen believed in *Wissenschaft*."[5] This steadfast devotion to science, above almost everything else, guided him through all of his endeavors. If Wellhausen hoped to disabuse the reading public of bibliolatry, he himself may well have bordered on a type of scientolatry.

To pursue the man who wrote the work, this chapter tracks, however briefly, the course of Wellhausen's life – his disposition and ambition, his decisions and positions. First, the inquiry examines whence he came. It begins with his home and with his homeland, exploring how this pastors's son ultimately found himself studying theology in Göttingen. It continues with the patronage and politics implied in the making of professors at that time. Indeed, Wellhausen had much to navigate as he sought to sail that ship of his professional career through those troubled waters of disciplines, faculties, and universities. Secondly, in view of these transitions, this chapter aims to pinpoint the orientalist against the shifting landscape of theology in the German Empire. Wellhausen found theology as difficult to manage as the word itself is to define. To understand his standpoint towards this polysemic term – a syndicate of institutions, a combination of activist propaganda forces in society, and a framework of theoretical rumination – this second section constructs a matrix of possible stances as represented by his colleagues, stressing a common if ambiguous diversity. It further addresses the dominance of theology as an institutionalized discipline within the human sciences. Finally, the chapter examines Wellhausen's conception of scholarship as well as his performance within the scientific sector. It explores his standing not only towards but also within his university, in the Prussian institutions of education and culture, and across all of academia worldwide. It considers his priorities,

[5] Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 179.

his interests, and his values. In the end, this chapter aspires to endorse neither admiration nor opposition but instead appreciation, in the sense of understanding – to comprehend more fully how the man was made who made the work.

1.1 The Making of a Professor: Patronage and Politics

Like much of the lettered elite, Julius Wellhausen was born a pastor's son and wed an academic's daughter.[6] In his own reflections on his childhood, preserved by Schwartz in the fullest account of the semitist's early life, Julius portrayed his father as aristocratic and highly cultured compared to the rest of the Hanoverian people, "a terribly unpolitical and uneducated crowd (*Völkchen*)."[7] Before coming to Hamlin as second city pastor, Gerhard Julius August (1808–1861) had served as cantor of the palace church and inspector of the court school in Hanover.[8] Though a strict, conservative Lutheran, father August could also speak sarcastically of his fellow men of the cloth – a penchant for ridicule passed on to the son. Julius fell heir from another side as well. The son delighted in frequent contact with the townspeople and enjoyed encounters with a farmer and a blacksmith in particular. Amidst financially trying times, Wellhausen later inherited from the former's legacy and battled the city elders to receive it. In what surely would have warmed the cockles of his heart, Schwartz remarked upon his death, "In connection to nature and the people, he always remained a country boy."[9] This upbringing provided a point of reference for the course of his career, which moved against the orthodoxy of his youth and persisted in the appreciation of

[6] This biographical information comes first and foremost from Eduard Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," in Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Geschäftliche Mitteilungen aus dem Jahre 1918* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1918), 43–73, at 45–46 [repr., without appendices, in idem, *Vergangene Gegenwärtigkeiten*, 1st ed. (Gesammelte Schriften 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938), 326–61], with citation following the original; as well as Rudolf Smend, "Julius Wellhausen," in idem, *From Astruc to Zimmerli*; idem, "Wellhausen in Göttingen," in *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, ed. Bernd Moeller (Göttinger Universitätsschriften A/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 306–24; idem, "Julius Wellhausen and His *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*," in *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, ed. Douglas A. Knight (Semeia 25; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 1–20, at 6 [the German manuscript was later published as "Julius Wellhausen und seine Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels," in idem, *Epochen der Bibelkritik* (Gesammelte Studien 3; Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 109; Munich: Kaiser, 1991), 168–85, and reprinted in idem, *Bibel und Wissenschaft. Historische Aufsätze* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 141–58]; cf. Reinhard G. Kratz, "Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918)," in idem, *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 3, *Mythos und Geschichte* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 102; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 67–86; idem, "Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918) und die Geschichte," 105–16.

[7] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 45–46.

[8] Friedrich Sprenger, *Geschichte der Stadt Hameln*, 2nd ed., ed. von Reitzenstein (Hameln: Schmidt & Suckert, 1861), 225–26, cf. 198. See further pp. 65–66 below.

[9] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 46.

Mother Earth and commoners. As Wellhausen recollected, "It was these circles that kept awake within me the belief in the robustness of the German people."[10] With a neuropathic father, a mother hard of hearing, and three siblings none of whom outlived their parents, he, too, required a certain amount of resilience, especially as youthful days turned into adult years. Wellhausen himself endured insomnia, gastric trouble, deafness by age 60, and arteriosclerosis. His wife, Marie (*née* Limpricht), early on became seriously ill and never fully recovered. A life without children exacted its own toll upon the two.

In regard to background, as in so many other respects, he conformed to the better part of the German professorate, which meant he differed from most of society. Wellhausen belonged to a tiny segment of the male population in the German-speaking lands – the one that attended select schools, studied at university, pursued academic careers, and maintained the institutions of "culture." At this time, the bonds of marriage and blood cemented *Bildungsbürgertum* (i. e., the educated middle classes), a social stratum fused further still by professional ties and social networks. Throughout the nineteenth century, somewhere between half and a third of scholars in the human sciences were related to another academic either by affinity or consanguinity, with every eleventh having a professor as a father, every sixteenth a professor as a brother, and every tenth a professor's daughter as a wife; while the figures waxed and waned with the fluctuating frequency of students in theology, not to mention geographic distribution, a large number of humanities professors came from the homes of clergymen as well.[11] Small coincidence the colleagues and confidants who sketched the most detailed portraits of Wellhausen the man were none other than the well-established classicists Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931) (the Junker who married Marie *née* Mommsen, the daughter of eminent ancient historian Theodor) and Schwartz (not only the husband of Emma Blumenbach – herself the daughter of Provincial Councillor Gustav Friedrich Anton, granddaughter of Privy Government Councillor Georg Heinrich Wilhelm, and great-granddaughter of famed Court Councillor, Chief Medical Councillor, and Göttingen anatomist and anthropologist Johann Friedrich – but also the son of Privy Court Councillor, Privy Medical Councillor, and gynecology professor at Göttingen Hermann together with Sophie *née* Michaelis, daughter of obstetrics professor Gustav Adolph and sister of archaeologist Adolf). In fact, Wellhausen's most devoted biographer, Rudolf Smend of Göttingen, is himself the son of an esteemed

[10] Ibid., 46–47.

[11] Marita Baumgarten, *Professoren und Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert. Zur Sozialgeschichte deutscher Geistes- und Naturwissenschaftler* (Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 121; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 93, 111; cf. also Johannes Wischmeyer, *Theologiae Facultas. Rahmenbedingungen, Akteure und Wissenschaftsorganisation protestantischer Universitätstheologie in Tübingen, Jena, Erlangen und Berlin 1850–1870* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 108; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), esp. 180–81.

professor of constitutional and canon law in Göttingen, Rudolf Smend, and grandson of a Göttingen Old Testament professor and dear friend of Wellhausen, also Rudolf Smend.

This heritage in that small but influential cultural bourgeoisie, which also bore the stamp of German Protestantism, presented a young, often uninterested Wellhausen with opportunities rare or nonexistent for most others in northern Germany and beyond. As Wellhausen recalled, his father owned the only copy of Goethe's work around, and though he did depict his juvenescence as fairly plain to Schwartz – absent any pathos or high literature – he could paint quite a different portrait upon his application to a junior post in Göttingen:

> But it should be added that since I was a child, I was delighted with the documents of the pietas of our forefathers and especially enjoyed those that seemed to me older and also the most difficult to understand. And, for sure, my study was particularly dedicated to German sacred poetry, and I cannot tell whether there are any ecclesiastical poems from the Reformation age, and even before, that I did not know or memorize. With equal love I appreciated the sacred melodies and learned with ease all to which I was listening. Then, when I started studying the dialect of the Middle Ages in Hanover, I was particularly attracted by the sermons of David – a monk of that order of the preachers of Augsburg – and of Berthold von Regensburg, a Minorite.[12]

Nevertheless, Wellhausen, who would achieve so much in academia, was an underachiever at school. Even Schwartz confessed, "He does not seem to have been what one would call a precocious child, to say nothing of a wunderkind."[13] The boy showed little aptitude for learning and formed few fond memories of his teachers. After initial schooling locally, Wellhausen went, at 15, to the Lyceum of Hanover, where he learned from headmaster and noted philologist Heinrich Ludolf Ahrens (1809–1881) – whom he also liked rather little. In the city of Hanover, the *Hamelner* longed for the ways of the land. Having apparently felt then he needed no education (or thought control), Wellhausen later seemed to pride himself on the distance maintained from instruction, which benefited greatly from the freedom granted to pupils. The kind of autonomy Wellhausen had ascribed to himself already as a schoolboy Schwartz saw confirmed in his withdrawal from perhaps the more usual pastimes of student life at university as well as in his personal exchanges: "He rivaled the proudest Lower Sachsen farmer with his feeling of independence."[14] Such self-determination would manifest itself in Wellhausen's professional choices too, as witnessed by Wilamowitz, who remembered, "But he kept his field of work in narrow bounds and also never

[12] Julius Wellhausen, curriculum vitae submitted in application for a position at the *Göttinger Stift*, in Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," Appendix 1 and repr. in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, Appendix 1, 787–88 at 787, cited according to the reprint. Sincere thanks are due to Emiliano Urciuoli and Andrea Nicolotti for their kind assistance in rendering the Latin properly.

[13] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 47.

[14] Ibid., 70.

felt the need to expand the horizon of his interests; he was entirely unresponsive to fine arts, for example."[15] However, the determining factor for university was reportedly his father. Walking in his footsteps, Wellhausen came to theology.

As the student set forth in theological studies, his pace eventually broke from a plod into a stride. Wellhausen matriculated at the University of Göttingen on April 24, 1862, and left – at least initially – seven semesters later, receiving a certificate on August 15, 1865. He served as a private tutor in Hanover until 1867, when he returned to Göttingen for the Michaelmas semester, hoping to train with Heinrich Ewald (1803–1875), master semitist and biblical scholar. Between 1868 and 1870, Wellhausen held an appointment as *Repetent* in the *Göttinger Stift*, that is, as tutor in the residentiary theological college.[16] On July, 9, 1870, he obtained his licentiate in theology with the 41-page dissertation *De gentibus et familiis Judaeis quae I. Chr. 2.4. enumerantur*, this degree being comparable to a master's.[17] A couple months later, in Michaelmas term, 1870, the young licentiate collected permission to teach, or *venia legendi,* entered the concomitant status of *Privatdozent* (i. e., unsalaried instructor) for "Old Testament theology," and lectured as such in Göttingen until 1872.[18] This theological path, however, he

[15] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen, 1848–1914,* 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Koehler, 1928), 188.

[16] Smend, "Wellhausen in Göttingen," 308–11.

[17] Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der K*[*öniglichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität aus dem Jahre 1875* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1875), 504. His status during these days proves difficult to discern from his letters alone, for he signed *Lic.* and *Lic./Privatdoz.* inconsistently between October 29, 1871, and July 9, 1872: see Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 8–13.

[18] The chronology is clear in those reports he so fondly styled "catacombs," namely, the *Nachrichten der K*[*öniglichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-August*(*s*)*-Universität* (Wellhausen to Theodor Nöldeke, April 10, 1911, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 574; Wellhausen to Ferdinand Justi, March 5, 1893, in ibid., 301–02): cf. Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der K*[*öniglichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität aus dem Jahre 1875*, 276. While this habilitation without a doctorate has occasioned some surprise among his commentators, the procedure was not at all uncommon at the time. Initially, the qualification indicated permission by a faculty to teach, accompanied the academic degree (be it licentiate or doctorate), and demanded no additional treatise; any further examination mostly concerned only those candidates coming from outside the university in question: cf. Sylvia Paletschek, "Zur Geschichte der Habilitation der Universität Tübingen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Das Beispiel der Wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen (ehemals Staatswirtschaftlichen/Staatswissenschaftlichen) Fakultät," in *200 Jahre Wirtschafts- und Staatswissenschaften an der Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen. Leben und Werk der Professoren. Die Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät der Universität Tübingen und ihre Vorgänger (1817–2002)*, ed. Helmut Marcon, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004), 1364–99; see further Wischmeyer, *Theologiae Facultas,* esp. 63–82; Matti Klinge, "Teachers," in *A History of the University in Europe,* Vol. 3, *Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800–1945),* ed. Walter Rüegg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 123–61. Only at the end of the nineteenth century did the habilitation process solidify across the germanophone lands into its form reflected today in the (now changing) German academic system, a development that corresponded to the period's broader social, cultural, and institutional shifts and standardizations. True, already in 1831, the University of Göttingen had launched considerable transformations in the institution of private

first trod without enthusiasm. The new matriculant found all too little inspiration in topics and teachers alike. He deemed the dogmatics of Albrecht Ritschl (1822–1889) unintelligible, describing the luminary as "without influence" upon him, though Wellhausen did admit, "Yet he seemed to me a completely different character than the other theologians, manly, open – not so damned South German."[19] Rather, Wellhausen's afflatus was philological science. As he would later affirm, albeit in an essay to abandon the discipline of theology, "I became a theologian because I was interested in the scientific treatment of the Bible …."[20] Indeed, the work of Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860), brokered to him by a fellow student who had studied in Tübingen, and that of Ewald, whose history of Israel captured his imagination, in 1863, woke Wellhausen to the critical study of ancient texts at university. He therefore could aver, "I did not make sense of the theological problems. Ewald interested me and for that reason the Bible, which I naturally knew very well," and further state, "Ewald has saved me, who at that time was mostly ridiculed."[21] So it was that an apathetic student of theology became a dedicated mentee of historical research.

In the autumn term of 1872, Wellhausen received appointment as full professor of Old Testament at the University of Greifswald, in the Faculty of Theology, at the rather customary age of 28. However, his licentiate was insufficient, for the chair necessitated a doctorate. On October 21, 1872, the University of Göttingen obliged and supplied him the credential: an honorary doctorate in theology (Dr. theol.).[22] Such accolade – or rather exigency – Wellhausen repaid with the

---

docentship, but as late as 1888, the regulations pertaining to the Faculty of Theology – which diverged from those of Philosophy and Law – permitted direct preferment from licentiate to private docent: cf. Paul Daude, *Die Rechtsverhältnisse der Privatdozenten. Zusammenstellung der an den Universitäten Deutschlands und Österreichs, sowie an den deutschsprachigen Universitäten der Schweiz über die rechtliche Stellung der Privatdozenten erlassenen Bestimmungen* (Berlin: Becker, 1896), 75–78, cf. 3, 7–8; for Greifswald's requirements, see ibid., 85–87.

[19] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 49.

[20] Wellhausen to the Prussian Minister of Culture, April 5, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 98–99, at 98.

[21] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 49.

[22] See Alfred Jepsen, "Wellhausen in Greifswald. Ein Beitrag zur Biographie Julius Wellhausens," in *Festschrift zur 500-Jahrfeier der Universität Greifswald, 17.10.1956* (Greifswald: Verlag der Volksstimme, 1956), 47–57, at 55 [repr. in idem, *Der Herr ist Gott* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1978), 241–70]; Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der K*[*öniglichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität aus dem Jahre 1875,* 660; cf. Wellhausen to the Theology Faculty, November 7, 1872, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 15; Rudolf Smend, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 78 (1981): 141–76, at 154; idem, "Julius Wellhausen and His *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*," 6. Though an otherwise solid translation, English renderings of this material designate the 1870 degree a "doctorate," which proves imprecise (Smend, "Julius Wellhausen," in idem, *From Astruc to Zimmerli*, 94; cf. also idem, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Magne Sæbø [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013], 424–53, at 440).

dedication of his 1874 *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*.[23] Still, the move was unexceptional. According to a recent study for the period of 1850–1870, the *doctor theologiae* had essentially become an honorary degree by the start of the nineteenth century, awarded more as decoration than accreditation.[24] Göttingen in particular had reserved its theological doctorate principally for such purposes ever since the university's foundation, an arrangement of conferral that lasted until the end of the nineteenth century.[25] Such findings accord with contemporaneous descriptions in the *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, a standard reference work at the time and predecessor of the *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*.[26] Nevertheless, many universities did require that their professors hold a doctorate, so the grade often came at appointment, either from the old or from the new institutional home. Once the Göttingen Faculty of Theology had bestowed on him the Doctor of Theology, Wellhausen disclosed in private correspondence that – beyond the compulsory oaths, the first in German to the worldly power, the second in Latin to the spiritual one – the Greifswald Faculty would have required him to earn a doctoral degree himself within a two-year timeframe had he not received it "*gratis*."[27]

[23] Julius Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte*, 1st ed. (Greifswald: Bamberg, 1874) [English Translation (ET): T*he Pharisees and the Sadducees: An Examination of Internal Jewish History*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Mercer Library of Biblical Studies; Macon: Mercer University Press, 2001), although the front cover reads *The Pharisees and Sadducees* and the original publication information provided misspells the German title]. On account of limited availability, I provide my own translation of this work. With regard to the work, Smend suggests, "This little book of the 30-year-old professor contains in all essentials the 'motives and principles' on which his future historiography was based, over and above his work on the sources" (idem, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," 443), with the secondary quotation apparently referring to a volume by Boschwitz on Wellhausen's historiography: cf. p. 75, n. 39 below.

[24] See Wischmeyer, *Theologiae Facultas*, esp. 70–73.

[25] For the University's earliest restrictions, see Wilhelm Ebel, ed., *Die Privilegien und Ältesten Statuten der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), esp. 102–04, §§18–24; cf. also Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 782 n. 1073. Even a brief survey of theological doctorates (or lack thereof) reported in the *Chronik der Georg-Augusts–Universität zu Göttingen* confirms the *de facto* legacy of such a stipulation.

[26] Gustav Frank, "Doctor theologiae," in *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, mit vielen protestantischen Theologen und Gelehrten*, Vol. 19, *Erster Supplement-Band,* 1st ed., ed. Johann Jakob Herzog (Gotha: Besser, 1865), 423–26; Gustav Leopold Plitt, "Grade, akademische in der Theologie," in *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, unter Mitwirkung vieler protestantischer Theologen und Gelehrten*, Vol. 5, *Geist bis Herder*, 2nd ed., ed. Johann Jakob Herzog and Gustav Leopold Platt, (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1879), 342–51. The *Real-Encyklopädie* underwent translation and revision as the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* and then *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*; for the publication history, see Samuel Macauley Jackson, "Preface," in *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge: Embracing Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology and Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Biography from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, Vol. 1, *Aachen–Basilians*, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson, (London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1908), ix–xii.

[27] Wellhausen to Paul de Lagarde, December 17, 1872, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 16–17; cf. also Wellhausen to Enno Littmann, May 4, 1916, in ibid., 646.

Gratuitous degrees were becoming more common, however. Throughout the 1870s, controversy surrounded the bestowal of doctorates.[28] In response to mounting allegations of plagiarism and similar misdeeds, Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903), with others, advocated for stricter measures of regulation, such as prohibiting conferral *in absentia* and demanding thesis publication.[29] As Fritz Ringer has shown, the faculties of arts at the smaller universities of Göttingen and Halle awarded on average 153 doctoral degrees annually between 1873 and 1875, compared to the approximate annual sum of 14 by that of the University of Berlin in the same period.[30] (From the medieval legacy, most universities comprised the "higher" faculties of theology, law, and medicine and the "lower" one arts or philosophy, which long encompassed natural and social sciences.) Finances also factored into the equation. On top of their salaries from the state, "ordinary" professors collected student fees for lectures and additional ones for examinations, most often receiving a higher amount for success than failure. In the decades of the *Gründerjahre* – once currency standardization had supplanted the silver thaler with the gold mark, in 1873 – the student fees for a Doctor of Theology in Göttingen, for example, typically cost 450 marks.[31] (Such fees could add material insult to social injury. By way of contrast, towards the end of the century in Prussia, private docents commonly subsisted on around 1,500 per year – about the same as a standard elementary school teacher – and associate professors on 5,000 annually, while the powerful *professores ordinarii* could range

[28] See further William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). In his 1918 presidential address to the American Oriental Society, Charles Cutler Torrey (1863–1956) likewise warned of the need to maintain high doctoral standards (idem, "The Outlook for American Oriental Studies. The Presidential Address for 1918," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 38 [1918]: 107–20, at 119).

[29] See the documentation in Max Oberbreyer, *Die Reform der Doctorpromotion. Statistische Beiträge*, 3rd ed. (Eisenach: Bacmeister, 1878); cf, e. g., idem, "Literatur zur Doktorfrage," *Zeitung für das höhere Unterrichtswesen* 5, no. 51 (December 21, 1876): 403–04; see, too, the exhaustive bibliography in Wilhelm Erman and Ewald Horn, ed., *Bibliographie der deutschen Universitäten. Systematisch geordnetes Verzeichnis der bis Ende 1899 gedruckten Bücher und Aufsätze über das Deutsche Universitätswesen*, Vol. 1 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904), 256–61, 266–67. For the various stipulations for degrees among Prussian universities prior to unification, see Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Koch, *Die Preussischen Universitäten. Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen, welche die Verfassung und Verwaltung dieser Anstalten betreffen*, Vol. 1, *Die Verfassung der Universitäten im Allgemeinen* (Berlin: Mittler, 1839); Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Dieterici, *Geschichtliche und statistische Nachrichten über die Universitäten im preußischen Staate* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1836).

[30] Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933*, rev. ed. (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1990), 51–52.

[31] Plitt, "Grade," 342–51; cf. also Otto Schröder, *Die Erteilung der Doktorwürde an den Universitäten Deutschlands* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1908); Max Baumgart, *Wegweiser zur Erlangung akademischer Würden. Grundsätze und Bedingungen der Erteilung der Doktor- und Lizentiaten-Würde …*, 6th ed. (Berlin: Decker, 1905); see further Uwe Meves, ed., *Deutsche Philologie an den preußischen Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert. Dokumente zum Institutionalisierungsprozess* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011).

significantly in their significant incomes, anywhere between 6,000 and 40,000 a year, with 12,000 being the norm.[32]) Although the proliferation controversy centered primarily on faculties of philosophy and lasted only a season, even Bernhard Stade (1848–1906), an eventual rival of Wellhausen's, felt compelled to enter the fray and defend the reputation of the theological doctorate.[33] The issue had especial bearing on Old Testament scholarship. With its embrace of sacred scriptures and Semitic languages, the field itself transected faculties of arts and of theology. Since the borders separating them were rather fluid at the time, both established scholars and aspiring academicians could and did transition between the two with relative ease throughout the course of their careers.[34] In fact, many a would-be theologian undertook postgraduate study in the faculty of arts given its conferral of earned doctorates, on the one hand, and the frequent requirement of such for professorial appointments, on the other. Though perhaps under difference circumstances, Wellhausen himself would relocate to the Faculty of Philosophy.

This honorary doctorate (Dr. theol.) would not be the last for Wellhausen. With his departure from institutional theology in general and Greifswald's in particular, the Faculty of Philosophy decorated him with a doctoral degree *honoris causa* (Dr. phil.), in 1882,[35] and almost twenty five years later, in 1906, its

[32] Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins*, 37–38; cf. Jan-Otmar Hesse, "German University Professors' salaries in the 20th Century. A Relative Income Approach," *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte/Economic History Yearbook* 54, no. 1 (2013): 111–27; see, too, Charles E. McClelland, *The German Experience of Professionalization: Modern Learned Professions and Their Organizations from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Hitler Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Christian Maus, *Der ordentliche Professor und sein Gehalt. Die Rechtsstellung der juristischen Ordinarien an den Universitäten Berlin und Bonn zwischen 1810 und 1945 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Einkommensverhältnisse* (Bonner Schriften zur Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte 4; Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2013).

[33] See Bernhard Stade, "Die neuesten Stimmen über die Reform der Doctorpromotion," *Die Grenzboten* 35, no 1/2 (1876): 450–57; cf. the editorial notes of the reprint in Oberbreyer, *Die Reform der Doctorpromotion*, 93–100; see also Wellhausen's later letter to the dean of the Göttingen Faculty of Philosophy, June 1, 1894, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 314–15. Stade himself had received from the University of Leipzig a Doctor of Philosophy, in 1871, along with a Licentiate of Theology and *venia legendi*, in 1873, and collected from the University of Giessen a Doctor of Theology *honoris causa* at his appointment there, in 1875; cf. p. 46 below.

[34] See Olaf Willet, *Sozialgeschichte Erlanger Professoren, 1743–1933* (Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 146; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 128–36; Wischmeyer, *Theologiae Facultas,* 63–82; cf. Ursula Wokoeck, *German Orientalism: The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945* (Culture and Civilization in the Middle East 16; New York: Routledge, 2009), 108–13, 123–27; Markus Iff, *Liberale Theologie in Jena. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte des ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts* (Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann 154; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 75–80.

[35] Jepsen, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 55; cf. also Samuel Ives Curtiss, "Professor Julius Wellhausen and His Theory of the Pentateuch," *The Expositor* 14, 3rd Series, 3, no. 2 (1886): 81–98, at 81–82.

Faculty of Law awarded him one as well (Dr. jur.).[36] That same year, the University of Edinburgh also agreed to bestow a Doctor of Laws on Wellhausen (LL.D.).[37] Although the University of Cambridge had hoped to grant him yet another honorary doctorate in the year 1913, arteriosclerosis and deafness prevented him from traveling, and conferment would have ostensibly required his physical presence.[38] An impressive list of letters stood thus behind the name of Julius Wellhausen, as demonstrated by the 1914 inventory of honorary members of the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen (now the Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities), which enumerated, "Dr. theol., jur., ph., Prof., Geh. Reg.-Rat."[39]

Nonetheless, this backing from the University of Göttingen surely relieved the *professor designatus*. Among the other concerns expressed in early correspondence with the Berlin biblical scholar, orientalist, and fellow Ewald student August Dillmann (1823–1894) was his fret about the lack of a *doctor theologiae* and its potential repercussions for the call to Greifswald.[40] While most interpreters emphasize Dillmann's role in the appointment, the drama that unfolded

---

[36] Samuel Oettli, *Das 450jährige Jubiläum der Universität Greifswald am 3. und 4. August 1906* (Greifswald: Abel, 1906), 47–49, 105; cf. Wellhausen to the Faculty of Law at the University of Greifswald, August 9, 1906, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 490. Boston's premier Unitarian weekly, *The Christian Register,* recorded the degree as a Doctor of Theology, for which I have found no other evidence (Charles W. Wendte, "International Notes 3," *The Christian Register* 85, no. 48 [1906]: 1336–37, at 1336; cf. N. N., "Nachrichten," *Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland* 57, no. 33 [1906]: 1157); Ernst Troeltsch, too, apparently received a Doctor of Philosophy, rather than the announced Doctor of Theology (cf. Oettli, *Das 450jährige Jubiläum der Universität Greifswald am 3. und 4. August 1906*, 51–52, 109). The role of Unitarians in disseminating germanophone biblical scholarship throughout the anglophone sphere deserves more scholarly attention (cf., e. g., Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*, 175–76, 247–48, 250).

[37] N. N., "Edinburgh. University News and Notes," *The University Review* 2 (October 1905–March 1906; London: Sherrat & Hughes, 1906), 600; cf. "Personalien," *Theologisches Literaturblatt* 27, no. 8 (1906): 96. In this regard, Wellhausen penned to Justi, "The English can do ever more than God: through their dictum they can create a *Doctor of Laws* out of me, though I understanding nothing of law. Admittedly, we also make *doctors of philosophy* out of pharmacists and farmers" (Wellhausen to Justi, [February 11, 1906,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 476, italics original, with the second originally in Latin). The edition of these letters seems unaware of this Edinburgh degree, however, as the respective annotation refers to the Dr. jur. h.c. from Greifswald.

[38] Wellhausen to Montague Rhodes James, December 11, 1913, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 611. Unfortunately, I have not been able to determine the specific type of doctorate.

[39] That is, Doctor of Theology, Law, Philosophy, Professor, Privy Government Councillor: "Verzeichnis der Mitglieder der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Ende März 1914," in Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Geschäftliche Mitteilungen aus dem Jahre 1914* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1914), 28–38, at 28.

[40] Wellhausen to August Dillmann, April 17, 1872, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 11; cf. his letter on April 8, 1872. Wellhausen wrote, however, "It would be downright absurd if I were created a Dr.Th. *ad hoc*." Peter Machinist deduced this sequence of events based entirely on the correspondence then unpublished (idem, "The Road Not Taken: Wellhausen and Assyriology," in *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded*, ed. Gershon Galil et al. [Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 130; Leiden: Brill, 2009], 469–531, at 472 n. 6, cf. 471 n. 4).

undoubtedly required other, more than mere supporting, actors. Dillmann secured for Wellhausen neither parchment nor position on his own. Internally, Wellhausen's nomination resulted from a settlement of sorts; externally, it likely served as but one small move in much wider struggles across university, state, and even society. Reminiscing over a half-century later, Wilamowitz recounted, "Thus he [sc., Wellhausen] came from the Göttingen *Stift* to Greifswald as a naive, inexperienced, cheerful, and peaceful soul. He entered a faculty in which orthodoxy and liberalism got along poorly, and the former gained the upper hand more and more through the intervention of the state."[41] Alfred Jepsen noted long ago the internal strife surrounding the appointment. Relegated to the political margins, a lone Johann Wilhelm Hanne (1813–1889) advocated for the right of liberal theology to coexist alongside the orthodox kind, represented by the rest of his colleagues, namely, Karl Wieseler (1813–1883), Otto Zöckler (1833–1906), and Hermann Cremer (1834–1903).[42] In the wake of Cremer's own contentious installment two years earlier, which had reportedly rocked university and city alike, the government representative recommended a compromise candidate. Wellhausen, the final selectee, had in fact originally placed distant third on both lists of candidates proposed: behind Paul Kleinert (1837–1920) and Ferdinand Mühlau (1839–1914) on the one and Ludwig Diestel (1825–1879) and Eberhard Schrader (1836–1908) on the other.[43] It may have been a damned nice thing – the nearest run thing he ever saw in his life.

While Jepsen suggested the same concern for accord may have motivated the Ministry of Culture at the time, the new minister likely had even greater ambitions. Wellhausen went to Greifswald at the dawn of a unified German Empire. The Iron Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck (1815–1898), had appointed liberal lawyer Adalbert Falk (1827–1900) – eponym of the Falk or May Laws –

[41] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen, 1848–1914*, 188. On the relationship between political and religious liberalism as well as the diversity within them, see Gangolf Hübinger, *Kulturprotestantismus und Politik. Zum Verhältnis von Liberalismus und Protestantismus im wilhelminischen Deutschland* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994); Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, "Kulturprotestantismus. Zur Begriffsgeschichte einer theologiepolitischen Chiffre," *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 28 (1984): 214–68; Dieter Langewiesche, *Liberalismus in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1988); cf. also Uriel Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany: Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914,* trans. Noah Jonathan Jacobs (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975); Matthias Wolfes, *Protestantische Theologie und Moderne Welt. Studien zur Geschichte der liberalen Theologie nach 1918* (Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann 102; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 29–71.

[42] Jepsen, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 48–51; cf. Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 17, 1872, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 11–2; see also his letter on October 16, [1882,] in ibid., 14–15. In the latter, he criticized the opposing fanaticisms of liberal and orthodox theology within the Greifswald faculty.

[43] For the dynamics of this appointment, see Jepsen, "Wellhausen in Greifswald"; cf. Smend, "Wellhausen in Greifswald." A similar set of affairs seems to have arisen in Berlin: see Erich Foerster, *Adalbert Falk. Sein Leben und Wirken als Preußischer Kultusminister* (Gotha: Klotz, 1927), 448–55.

only in January, 1872, thereby displacing the orthodox Heinrich von Mühler (1813–1874) he so despised.[44] Though certainly preoccupied with an ill-fated *Kulturkampf* (1871–1887), the onset of numerous battles over secondary education, and the manifold other concerns implicated in any governmental ministry properly charged with "ecclesiastical, educational, and medical affairs," the *Kultusministerium* possessed and exercised substantial power in appointment proceedings, albeit often pending approval from a frequently adversarial Ministry of Finance.[45] Whether theologian Otto Pfleiderer (1839–1908) in Berlin, economist Karl Umpfenbach (1832–1907) in Königsberg, philosopher Friedrich Albert Lange (1828–1875) in Marburg, or jurists Paul Hinschius (1835–1898) in Berlin and Johann Friedrich von Schulte (1827–1914) in Bonn, Falk did not eschew promoting potential allies even when it conflicted with the express will of universities or faculties – a portent of the "System Althoff" to come.[46] Wilamowitz later bemoaned "Berlinocracy."[47] Alongside such circumstantial evidence, Falk himself once journaled, "In the attempt to hold together and consolidate the national church, I opposed the exclusivity of the orthodox party and broke it, creating space for other schools of thought to move."[48] Now, Falk may not have lasted long – an early casualty of Bismarck's so-called conservative turn – but the years 1872 to 1879 did see his significant if understudied impact. Wellhausen may have therefore served as a tool to break that orthodox party Falk opposed, as a lever if not a hammer.

Between an initial faculty preference and the final ministerial pronouncement, however, spun any number of cogs. In May and July, 1872, Wellhausen broached the appointment proceedings at Greifswald to orientalist-turned-bureaucrat Justus Olshausen (1800–1882), a privy government councillor and expert ad-

[44] Falk served as Prussian *Kultusminister* from January 22, 1872, until July 14, 1879, which spelled the end of the *Kulturkampf*. See Stefan Ruppert, *Kirchenrecht und Kulturkampf. Historische Legitimation, politische Mitwirkung und wissenschaftliche Begleitung durch die Schule Emil Ludwig Richters* (Jus Ecclesiasticum 70; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 70.

[45] Often translated "Ministry of Culture" or the like, *Kultusministerium* designated unofficially the official Prussian Ministry of Ecclesiastical, Educational, and Medical Affairs (*Ministerium der geistlichen, Unterrichts- und Medizinalangelegenheiten*), which began as Wilhelm von Humboldt's (1767–1835) Section for Culture and Education within the Prussian Interior Ministry in 1809 and existed as an independent entity from 1817 to 1918.

[46] See Foerster, *Adalbert Falk*, 448–55; Christian Tilitzki, *Die Albertus-Universität Königsberg. Ihre Geschichte von der Reichsgründung bis zum Untergang der Provinz Ostpreußen*, Vol. 1, *1871–1918* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012) 24, 79, 81–88, 100, cf. 53–54; Ulrich Sieg, "Der Preis des Bildungsstrebens. Jüdische Geisteswissenschaftler im Kaiserreich," in *Juden, Bürger, Deutsche. Zur Geschichte von Vielfalt und Differenz, 1800–1933* (Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 72–73; Ruppert, *Kirchenrecht und Kulturkampf*, 162–63, 172–73, 220–21; cf. Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany, 1700–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 290–93.

[47] Wilamowitz, *Erinnerungen*, 186–87.

[48] Foerster, *Adalbert Falk*, 413. Falk continued on to rue the return of the orthodox owing to interventions from the Kaiser.

visor to the Prussian *Kultusministerium* who directed university matters for the Ministry from 1858 to 1874 and owed his own career largely to the support of none other than Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859). Olshausen, too, was of decidedly liberal persuasion, as reported by the *Allgemeine Zeitung* already at his nomination, in 1858.[49] He had a hand, for instance, in the remuneration and/or appointment of Mommsen, Heinrich von Treitschke (1834–1896), Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911), and even the Jewish Heymann Steinthal (1823–1899).[50] Wellhausen was doubtless no different. Help had also come from Wellhausen's *alma mater*. Ritschl figured in his private letters to both Olshausen and Dillmann, and Ritschl – himself no lightweight – had friends in high places too, notably the canonist Emil Herrmann (1812–1885), who acted as president of the Prussian Protestant Senior Church Council from 1872 to 1877 and likewise shared liberal sympathies.[51] As revealed to Wellhausen by Friedrich Ehrenfeuchter (1814–1878) – a Göttingen professor of theology and influential church official – his own theological disposition was of concern to some in the Greifswald Faculty of Theology.[52] A series of wheels therefore needed greasing. Yet Wellhausen seems to have allayed such worries discreetly and effectively. His correspondence suggests a company of patrons, including Dillmann, made every political hill and religious mountain low.[53]

A certain irony emerges here, however. The Prussian subject working at a university of the state to educate students for the church found himself at a precarious crossroads of allegiance. In addition, Wellhausen's appointment apparently hinged upon a relatively neutral posture and conciliatory effect. Facing these ob-

[49] N. N., "Deutschland, Berlin," *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg) 342 (Wednesday, December 8, 1858), 5524, which referred to information published in the *National-Zeitung* of Berlin.

[50] For von Treitschke, see Wolfgang Neugebauer, "Wissenschaftsautonomie und universitäre Geschichtswissenschaft im Preußen des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Die Berliner Universität im Kontext der deutschen Universitätslandschaft um 1800, um 1860 und um 1910*, ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch, in cooperation with Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 76; Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010), 129–48; for Dilthey, see Dilthey, *Briefwechsel, 1852–1911*, Vol. 1, *1852–1882,* ed. Gudrun Kühne-Bertram and Hans-Ulrich Lessing (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 590, 636, 890, 892, 896; for Mommsen, see Lothar Wickert, *Theodor Mommsen. Größe und Grenzen* (Theodor Mommsen. Eine Biographie 4; Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1980), 9, 14–15; for Steinthal, see Hans-Ulrich Lessing, "Heymann Steinthal: Linguistics with a Psychological Basis," in *Contributions to Comparative Indo-European, African and Chinese Linguistics: Max Müller and Steinthal*, ed. Joan Leopold (Prix Volney Essay Series 3; Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999), 13.

[51] On Ritschl's connections in this regard, see Joachim Weinhardt, *Wilhelm Herrmanns Stellung in der Ritschlschen Schule* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 97; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996), 50–54, 58.

[52] Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 17, 1872, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 11; cf. also Wellhausen to the Göttingen Faculty of Theology, March 4, 1870, in ibid., 7; Wellhausen to Ernst Bertheau, January 11, 1874, in ibid., 22–23.

[53] So Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 8, 1872, in ibid., 9–10; Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 17, 1872, in ibid., 11–12; cf. also Wellhausen to Dillmann, October 16, [1872,] in ibid., 14–15; see too Wellhausen to Paul de Lagarde, February 19, 1873, in ibid., 19–20.

stacles, he had no small aid to plead his case. He maneuvered – and maneuvered quite well – across the conflicted and conflicting forces in appointing professors of theology at universities of the state. Yet the semitist remained steadfast in his disagreement with the deployment of academical means to ecclesiastical ends, in his objection to political interventions (be it "Falkish" or, later, "Zedlitzish") into ecclesiastical matters, and – to complete the triangle – in his disapproval of political involvement in academical affairs.[54] Indeed, Wellhausen perpetuated the mystifying propaganda of a meritocratic, detached science. Nonetheless, he occupied the chair in Greifswald on November 20, 1872 – but would soon leave both behind.[55]

"In going to Halle, he [sc., Wellhausen] finds a larger, more famous school, but is given a place of lower rank," wrote William Rainey Harper (1856–1906) of Baptist Union Theological Seminary in September 1882. "His future course will doubtless be watched with undiminished interest. Will he go farther away from all that is theological?"[56] The answer, in short, was yes. After only a decade in Greifswald (1872–1882), Wellhausen abandoned theology proper, occupying a post as associate professor of oriental languages in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Halle. Although commentators past and present have usually portrayed the shift as compulsory, Wellhausen himself stressed the move was voluntary and, in fact, desired.[57] He emphasized time and again the full volition involved in his departure from the Faculty in particular and the enterprise of theology in general. Furthermore, he utterly despised the characterization of his transition as anything even resembling a martyrdom – a mischaracterization long recirculated, most recently by a scholar of biblical literature who lionizes, "Wellhausen suffered both socially and professionally for this insistence upon intellectual freedom in his scholarship."[58] True, even the likes of Wilamowitz could perpetuate

[54] Cf., e. g., Wellhausen to Smend, February 26, 1892, in ibid., 277–78.

[55] Cf. Jepsen, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 48.

[56] William Rainey Harper, "Editorial Notes. Wellhausen," *The Hebrew Student* 2, no. 1 (1882): 26–27, at 27; by contrast, fellow Chicago professor Curtiss (1844–1904), of Chicago Theological Seminary, opined, "His acceptances of an extraordinary professorship of Oriental languages at Halle was not a promotion in any sense. But his departure from Greifswald was of his own free will and highly honourable to him" (idem, "Professor Julius Wellhausen and His Theory of the Pentateuch," 81). The Harper attestation stems from his office as editor; the article itself went unsigned. This journal went through several iterations: *The Old Testament Student* (1883–89), *The Hebrew Student* (1882–1883), *The Old Testament Student* (1883–89), *The Old and New Testament Student* (1889–92), *The Biblical World* (1893–1920), *The Journal of Religion* (1921 to present) – the latter only after merging with *The American Journal of Theology* (1897–1920).

[57] Wellhausen to Smith, [Summer 1882,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 107; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, December 16, 1894, in ibid., 325; cf. Wellhausen to Friedrich Althoff, February 12, 1886, in ibid., 192.

[58] Jeffrey Stackert, *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 202. Unfortunately, Stackert proves symptomatic of a tendency widespread among disciplinary historiographers – be they biblical scholars or theologians – in propagating all too common caricatures of not only the man but also his work.

such a narrative, but already in his eulogy of Wellhausen, Schwartz had stressed how the issue with Halle was primarily personal and financial.[59] The man himself declared, "The worst would be if someone would make me into some kind of a gentle martyr; I don't consider myself a martyr in the least. But perhaps all my worries are unfounded; no church party can easily use me as evidence for its purposes."[60] Responding to cuneiformist Hugo Winckler's (1863–1913) later description of him as such, in the socialist periodical *Die Zukunft*, Wellhausen became downright annoyed:

> It only irritated me that he called me a martyr. What sort of ignorance (*Dummheit*) is that! No one in Greifswald or outside Greifswald did me any harm; and I myself have not suffered in the least for leaving Greifswald. I would be very grateful to Mr W. if he had spared me this accolade and on my count upbraided me instead 100 000 × more.[61]

In fact, Wellhausen had written Olshausen already in 1879 to request a transition to a faculty of arts, declaring it felt like a lie "that I should educate the servants of a church to which I do not at heart belong" – a sentiment he expressed again in letters to the Ministry of Culture in 1880 and 1882.[62] Wellhausen found theology as an enterprise distressing not only at the University Greifswald but also at any Prussian university, for that matter.[63] Discontentment had rumbled even earlier, however. In December of 1873, he had solicited an exemption from administering theological examinations before the need had arisen in the first place, the reason being "remote[ness] from actual theology" and no "orientat[ion] to the fields of New Testament, Church History, or Dogmatics."[64] He may resemble a Cassandra – or simply someone self-aware. Concern about his fit with the Faculty of Theology had surfaced as early as 1872, in the letter to Dillmann that actually preceded his appointment and honorary doctorate.[65]

---

[59] Cf. William M. Calder, III, "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: *Sospitator Euripidis*" *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 27, no. 4 (1986): 409–30, at 416–17; Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 58–59.

[60] Wellhausen to Smith, [summer 1882,] in idem, *Briefe*, 107.

[61] Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, December 16, 1894, in ibid., 325.

[62] Wellhausen to Olshausen, February 9, 1879 in ibid., 55–56, at 55; Wellhausen to the Ministry of Culture, April 5, 1882, in ibid., 98–99; see further Wellhausen to Albert Socin, December 22, 1879, in ibid., 65; Wellhausen to Kuenen, June 14, 1881, in ibid., 82–84; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, June 16, 1881, in ibid., 84; Wellhausen to Smith, [October 1881,] in ibid., 93, 95. The letter from 1880, though mentioned in that from 1882, has not been preserved. In the letter to Olshausen, Wellhausen appealed to the support of Mommsen for the appointment, who knew Olshausen from childhood (cf. Wickert, *Theodor Mommsen*, 9). Father-in-law to Wilamowitz – who was Wellhausen's friend already in Greifswald – Mommsen received numerous books and letters from Wellhausen himself. In addition to appreciating each other's work, Wellhausen proofread Mommsen's as a specialist as well.

[63] E. g., Wellhausen to Socin, December 22, 1879, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 65.

[64] Wellhausen to Olshausen, December 28, 1873, in ibid., 22.

[65] Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 17, 1872, in ibid., 11–12.

At no point did Wellhausen express regret at his decision to, in his own words, "abandon theology."[66]

Although indeed a demotion in terms of rank as well as pay, Wellhausen's new position was also a promotion. In her standard institutional history, Marita Baumgarten has deduced the relative prestige of universities at the time based on *ordinarius* appointment and recruitment. As the great "end station" universities, Berlin, Munich, and Leipzig enjoyed a pride of place, followed closely by Bonn and Heidelberg. Whereas Göttingen, Halle, Strasbourg, Tübingen, and Würzburg constituted the "renowned universities for advancement," Breslau, Freiburg, Marburg, Königsberg, and Jena comprised a class of "less esteemed, transition universities," while Kiel, Giessen, Erlangen, and Greifswald all served as "entrance" universities for a first full professorship and Rostock brought up the rear.[67] The Halle move was upward indeed. If also "more in touch with the rest of the world," Halle, in Wellhausen's opinion, came at another price: an uncomfortable proximity to Leipzig, with its substantial influence despite an alleged mediocrity, and a requirement, associated with his post, to join the board of the German Oriental Society (*Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft*).[68] In fact, Wellhausen had previously imparted to the Ministry of Culture an intention to resign his appointment in Greifswald so he could move to Halle or back to Göttingen as a private docent and pursue habilitation in Semitic philology instead.[69] While this suggestion may have merely been a careful calculation – an attempt to secure further prospects elsewhere in case the targeted position in Königsberg did not materialize – he did express such plans in personal correspondence, too.[70] With his eye on an *ordinarius* position in Semitics, Wellhausen informed

[66] Wellhausen to Smith, [early 1882,] in ibid., 96–97, at 97; Wellhausen to Smith, May 11, 1882, in ibid., 100–01, at 101; see further Wellhausen to Socin, May 12, 1882, in ibid., 101–02; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, May 1, 1884, in ibid., 146–47; Wellhausen to Smith, [summer 1882,] in ibid., 107; Wellhausen to Althoff, February 12, 1886, in ibid., 192; cf. Wellhausen to Alfred Pernice, July 15, 1894, in ibid., 318–19; cf. also Smend, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 167–68.

[67] Baumgarten, *Professoren und Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert*, 272; cf. idem, "Berufungswandel und Universitätssystem im 19. Jahrhundert. Die Universität Greifswald," in *Die Universität Greifswald und die deutsche Hochschullandschaft im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Werner Buchholz (Pallas Athene 10; Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004), 87–115. Baumgarten's prosopographical study concentrates on faculties of philosophy (more than those of theology, law, or medicine), which quickly rose to prominence after university reforms in the early nineteenth century and at that time encompassed both human and natural sciences.

[68] Wellhausen to Smith, August 24, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 108–09; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, August 11, 1881, in ibid., 87–88. The 832nd to join the society, in 1882, he began on the editorial board the following year. On the history of the DMG, see Mangold, *Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft"*, 176–225; cf. also Wokoeck, *German Oreintalism*, 133–42.

[69] Wellhausen to the Ministry of Culture, April 5, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 98–99; cf. Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, December 2, 1881, in ibid., 92–93.

[70] Cf. Wellhausen to Socin, December 22, 1879, in ibid., 65; Wellhausen to Smith, November 16, 1881, in ibid., 91–92; Wellhausen to Smith [1882], in ibid., 96–97; Wellhausen to Smith, May 11, 1882, in ibid., 100–01; Wellhausen to Socin, May 12, 1882, in ibid., 101–02.

Friedrich Althoff (1839–1908), in 1883, he would much rather have a few more years in Halle "to be able to fill in as much hiddenness possible the many gaps in my knowledge," after which he would be sufficiently prepared for a chair – most preferably in Marburg.[71] Years later, he would greet the prospect of a return with mixed feelings.[72]

After a triennium in Halle (1882–1885), Wellhausen once again occupied a full professorship, but one at the University of Marburg and in the Faculty of Arts. Already six years prior, while at Greifswald, he had suggested this proposal to Olshausen, hoping to "be freed from a situation that torments me more than you will believe."[73] But if the *Philippina* had long been his goal, he did not reach this destination without plotting the course strategically. Just as Wellhausen had advocated the creation of a chair in Semitic philology at Marburg between 1879 and 1885 – through justification by comparison with Breslau, Göttingen, Greifswald, Halle, Kiel, and Königsberg – so also he had opposed appointment in Königsberg and Breslau.[74] (These universities all belonged to Prussia as of 1866: Wellhausen preferred an associate professorship in the Kingdom to a full one anywhere else in the *Reich*,[75] although Berlin – the pinnacle of Prussian universities – exerted little pull upon him.[76]) However, once the Ministry of Finance finally did approve establishment of this *ordinarius* position,[77] an even higher hurdle then appeared

[71] Wellhausen to Althoff, July 21, 1883, in ibid., 127–28; cf. Wellhausen to Heinrich Limpricht, January 10, 1884, in ibid., 139–40. In 1882, Wellhausen had acknowledged his qualifications as a hebraist, instead of a Semitic philologist proper: cf. Wellhausen to the Ministry of Culture, April 5, 1882, in ibid., 98–99.

[72] Cf. Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, January 15, 1890, in ibid., 248–49; Wellhausen to Smith, January 31, 1890, in ibid., 249–50.

[73] Wellhausen to Olshausen, February 9, 1879, in ibid., 55–56; cf. Wellhausen to Althoff, April 5, 1884, in ibid., 145; see also Wellhausen to Smith, [Summer 1882,] in ibid., 107. At the time of Wellhausen's transition, Althoff was Privy Government Councillor; Gustav von Goßler, the Minister of Culture.

[74] See Wellhausen to Althoff, July 21, 1883, in ibid., 127–28; Wellhausen to Althoff, August 17, 1883, in ibid., 130; Wellhausen to Althoff, April 5, 1884, in ibid., 145; Wellhausen to Althoff, December 18, 1884, in ibid., 159–60, Wellhausen to Althoff, March 20, 1885, in ibid., 170; cf. Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, [February/March, 1884,] in ibid., 143.

[75] Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, May 6, 1883, in ibid., 120.

[76] Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, [June 1883,] in ibid., 122.

[77] See Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, May 6, 1883, in ibid., 120; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, July 11, 1883, in ibid., 125; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, May 1, 1884, in ibid., 146–47; Wellhausen to Hermann, May 15, 1884, in ibid., 147–48; Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, May 18, 1884, in ibid., 148–50; Wellhausen to Heinrich Limpricht, [July 1884?,] in ibid., 152; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, October 20, 1884, in ibid., 156–58. Now allocated to "Semitic philology and oriental history," Wellhausen's Marburg post had undergone a new delineation. As another instance of fluidity between faculties of arts and theology, his predecessor, Franz Dietrich (1810–1883), had, since 1848, held a post for "oriental and early German literature" in the Faculty of Philosophy but then occupied another, for "Old Testament exegesis and oriental languages," in the theological one from 1859 until his death, in 1883 (cf. [Johann Adam] Heilmann, "Ein Polyhistor der Marburger Universität. Zum hundertjährigen Geburtstag Franz Dietrichs," *Hessenland. Zeitschrift für hessische Geschichte und Literatur* 24,

on the horizon: the Faculty of Theology. There, *Alttestamentler* Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin (1847–1926) raised resistance against him at first.[78] As a condition of appointment, the Ministry of Culture initially forbade Wellhausen from teaching any courses on the biblical texts, including Hebrew grammar.[79] He groused about his "muzzle" especially when compared to other semitists – arguing he knew more about the Old Testament than any other run-of-the-mill Semitic philologist – and suspected the dispute lay in a fear of competition on the part of Baudissin. However, greater change was underway.

The opposition to Wellhausen teaching the Old Testament may have certainly been personal and local, but circumscription in and of itself converged with greater institutional shifts. In her detailed study of German orientalist scholarship, Mangold(-Will) has shown how most orientalists housed in faculties of philosophy had ceased to give lessons in biblical interpretation, or exegesis, by 1850, and even instruction in Hebrew language and literature declined within these faculties over the second half of the nineteenth century.[80] As Ursula Wokoeck further emphasizes in her own monograph on the topic, faculties of arts located at universities structured on the northern, Protestant model operated, historically, as auxiliary centers of learning for the "higher" faculties of theology, law, and medicine – a situation that changed drastically with the institution of state exams together with the centralization of power in the Prussian Ministry of Culture.[81] Faculties of theology had once held substantial sway over appointment proceedings to positions in the "lower" one (i. e., philosophy), and many theologians supported the creation of chairs in oriental languages in faculties of philosophy, either to promote the deployment of historicist philology upon the biblical texts or to form a sort of buffer between such efforts and sacred scripture. But as the

---

no. 13 [1910]: 177–78; Franz Gundlach, *Catalogus Professorum Academiae Marburgensis. Die akademischen Lehrer der Philipps-Universität in Marburg*, Vol. 1, *Von 1527 bis 1910* [Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hessen und Waldeck 15; Marburg: Elwert, 1927], 424–25; see, more broadly, Mangold, *Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft"*, 155–56; Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 144).

[78] Cf. Wellhausen to Hermann, May 15, 1884, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 147–48; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, October 20, 1884, in ibid., 156–58; Wellhausen to Althoff, December 18, 1884, in ibid., 159–60; Wellhausen to Smith, January 21, 1885, in ibid., 166–67; Wellhausen to Kuenen, January 22, 1885, in ibid., 168; see further Smend, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 169 n. 126.

[79] See Wellhausen to the Representative of the Ministry at Marburg, November 5, 1886, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 202; cf. Wellhausen to Althoff, July 19, 1888, in ibid., 215–16; Wellhausen to Althoff, October 12, 1888, in ibid., 216; Wellhausen to Althoff, October 16, 1888, in ibid., 217.

[80] Sabine Mangold, *Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft"*, 61–64.

[81] Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 44, 86–116; for the period preceding the Wihelmine era, see also Mangold, *Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft"*; Wischmeyer, *Theologiae Facultas*, 63–82. However, Wokoeck departs – explicitly, at times significantly – from the interpretations of Mangold and Ludmila Hanisch, *Die Nachfolger der Exegeten. Deutschsprachige Erforschung des Vorderen Orients in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003): see especially her introduction, which offers an insightful meditation on method.

faculty of arts increasingly gained independence within the university system – especially owing to its importance for training teachers in service to the state educational apparatus – theologians risked losing not only student fees for the study of biblical languages and literatures but also professorial positions. Competition rose in consequence. Where professors of theology had often sought to place their own graduates in the faculty of arts to train theology students in philology, they developed another strategy as well: they combined "biblical" oriental languages (primarily Hebrew) with existing Old Testament chairs and left "non-biblical" ones (largely Arabic) to the "other" faculty, a distribution of labor parallel to the southern, Catholic model.[82] This division, too, conformed to larger trends of specialization, differentiation, and institutionalization. The subject of oriental philology increasingly bifurcated, institutionally, into positions for Sanskrit and comparative grammar over against Semitics. The study of Semitic languages, however, eventually split into separate chairs for the biblical and non-biblical kind, while Sanskrit itself branched into indology and iranology, with comparative grammar then evolving into Indo-European or Indo-German studies.[83]

Local competition, suspected by Wellhausen, was one aspect among others. He hoped to keep one foot on each of two tectonic plates as they were coming to shift, even if the theologians at Marburg were perhaps trying to push him off of theirs. In negotiations to annul the restriction, Wellhausen articulated his desire to offer lectures in exegesis – that is, interpretation of ancient texts – but expressed his regard of such "systematic" courses as introduction to the Old Testament, Old Testament theology, archaeology, and geography as the "exclusive domain of the theological representative of the Old Testament" and reiterated his intention to avoid any potential conflict in teaching.[84] He also reported members of the Faculty of Theology, including Baudissin himself, had altered their position, requesting that he hold lectures on the biblical texts. Once granted his wish, Wellhausen had no real reason to go. In 1888, Göttingen's Faculty of Arts listed him first to replace the deceased Ernst Bertheau (1812–1888), but its Faculty of Theology protested against him as well as Georg Hoffmann (1845–1933), which caused him no dismay and permitted his friend Smend (Sr.) to transfer there from Basel.[85]

---

[82] Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, 108–113, 125–26.

[83] For more precise discussion, see ibid., 117–45; Tuska Benes, *In Babel's Shadow: Language, Philology, and the Nation in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Kritik: German Literary Theory and Cultural Studies; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2008); cf. also Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, *The Nay Science: A History of German Indology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

[84] Cf. Wellhausen to Althoff, October 16, 1888, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 217; Wellhausen to Althoff, March 8, 1892, in ibid., 278–79.

[85] Wellhausen to Smith, July 18, 1888, in ibid., 215; Wellhausen to Althoff, July 19, 1888, in ibid., 215–16; Wellhausen to Smith, October 23, 1888, in ibid., 217–18; Wellhausen to Kuenen, November 9, 1888, in ibid., 221; cf. also Wellhausen to Althoff, May 9, 1888, in ibid., 213–14

Two years later, in 1890, Wellhausen received a formal call to Tübingen (refused with no great difficulty) in addition to unofficial inquiries from Heidelberg and Halle (likewise declined with ease).[86] Despite the usual complaints against the university politics at work in the Prussian Ministry of Culture, which would have reached him anywhere, he had little reason to leave Marburg, all the more given his comfortable salary and the area, which pleased him.[87]

But if Göttingen once refused Wellhausen, Wellhausen could not refuse Göttingen in the end, or at least not the infamous Althoff. After less than a decade in Marburg (1885–1892), he returned to his *alma mater* – more or less by force – to occupy the chair of Johann David Michaelis (1717–1791), Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752–1827), Ewald, and Paul Anton de Lagarde, *né Bötticher*, (1827–1891) as Professor of Oriental Languages in the Faculty of Philosophy, a post he held until retirement (1892–1913).[88] Wellhausen had in fact preferred to stay in Marburg. He even declined an initial offer. As he considered the prospect, Wellhausen informed his confidant Smend that Marburg much more than sufficed, citing reasons professional and personal alike.[89] However, if "bombard[ment]" from Wilamowitz and Rudolf von Jhering (1818–1892) could not prevail upon him,[90]

(although the note to this letter misprints Bertheau's year of death as 1889 rather than 1888 [ibid., 693; cf. 850]); Wellhausen to Smend, October 26, 1888, in ibid., 218; see, too, Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, [December, 1887,] in ibid., 212–13. On the shifting landscape – and several reversals of position – between these two faculties for this chair's appointment proceedings, see Smend, "Wellhausen in Göttingen," 316; idem, *Kritiker und Exegeten. Porträtskizzen zu vier Jahrhunderten alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 438–39.

[86] For Tübingen, see Wellhausen to the University Chancellor, January 6, 1890, January, 10, 1890, January [12], 1890, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 243–48; cf. Wellhausen to Socin, April 12, 1889, in ibid, 241; see, too, e. g., Ludwig Quidde, "Nachrichten und Notizen. Personalien," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 3, no. 1 (1890): 268–69, at 268. For Heidelberg, see Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, January 15, 1890, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 248–49; Wellhausen to Smith, January 31, 1890 in ibid., 249–50. For Halle, see Wellhausen to Socin, December 2, 1889, in ibid., 240; but cf. Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, January 15, 1890, in ibid., 248–49; Wellhausen to Smith, January 31, 1890, in ibid., 249–50. Already in 1879, Tübingen had placed Wellhausen third on their list of potential candidates; when the first two declined and his name was left, however, the Ministry refused his appointment on account of "anti-theological views" in writing and teaching alike (see Jepsen, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 52, Appendix 7; Wellhausen to Smith, August 16, 1879, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 61–62).

[87] Cf. Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, May 6, 1883, in ibid., 120; Wellhausen to Smith, October 23, 1888, in ibid., 217–18; Wellhausen to Smend, October 26, 1888, in ibid., 218; cf. Wellhausen to Socin, April 12, 1889, in ibid, 241; cf. Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, January 7, 1890, in ibid., 244.

[88] Wellhausen received emeritus status the fall of 1913 (cf. Wellhausen to Jülicher, May 24, 1913, in ibid., 603).

[89] Wellhausen to Smend, January 17, 1892, in ibid., 275.

[90] See Wellhausen to Adolf Harnack, April 25, 1892, in ibid., 284; cf. Wilamowitz to Althoff, January 12, 1892, in *Berufungspolitik innerhalb der Altertumswissenschaft im wilhelminischen Preußen. Die Briefe Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs an Friedrich Althoff (1883–1908)*, ed. William M. Calder, III, and Alexander Košenina (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1989),

Althoff's summons to Berlin produced the expected result.[91] Just before their meeting, in a note to his good friend and colleague Ferdinand Justi (1837–1907), Wellhausen channeled Hamlet with "O horrible! most horrible!" and invoked the Quran with "may God curse him."[92] In consequence, resentful he went to Göttingen, but to Göttingen he did go.[93] Wellhausen may have enjoyed reunion with Smend and Wilamowitz, but for years he carped about his situation and longed for a return to Marburg.[94] Apart from the local landscape, whose bucolic features charmed the romantic in him, Wellhausen bewailed students, institution, and colleagues all the same. As eminent semitist Nöldeke had stood first on the list for appointment to the chair – and yet successfully refused – he grew all the more indignant.[95] Having entered here, however, Wellhausen abandoned all hope in the end.[96] In Halle, he had declared he would crawl on his knees to *retour* to Göttingen; in Marburg, he had stated he would seize any possibility for a return to Göttingen if he could not teach exegesis; but once in Göttingen he avowed he would crawl back to Marburg were it not for his friend Smend.[97] So it was that Wellhausen accepted his lot. He even rejected a subsequent offer from Leipzig.[98]

82–85; Wilamowitz to Althoff, March 12, 1892, in ibid., 88–90; Wilamowitz to Althoff, July 3, 1892, in ibid., 91–92.

[91] See Wellhausen to Althoff, March 8, 1892, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 278–79; Wellhausen to Smend, March 8, 1892, in ibid., 279–89; Wellhausen to Justi, March 9, 1892, in ibid., 280; Wellhausen to Smith, in ibid., 280, 282; Wellhausen to Althoff, April 5, 1892, in ibid., 282–83; Wellhausen to Justi, April 5, 1892, in ibid.; Wellhausen to von Jhering, April 24, 1892, in ibid; cf. Wellhausen to Althoff, March 3, 1892, in ibid., 284.

[92] Wellhausen to Ferdinand Justi, April 5, 1892, in ibid., 283. The Shakespeare citation came in German; the Quran, in Arabic.

[93] Cf. Wellhausen to Socin, May 10, 1892, in ibid., 285–86; Wellhausen to Smith, May 31, 1892, in ibid., 286, 288.

[94] Cf., e. g., Wellhausen to Edward Schröder, August 11, 1892, in ibid., 290; Wellhausen to Justi, September 21, 1892, in ibid., 290–91; Wellhausen to Smith, October 6, 1892, in ibid., 291–92; Wellhausen to Justi, October 26, 1892, in ibid., 292; Wellhausen to Smith, November 6, 1892, in ibid., 293; Wellhausen to Wilhelm Herrmann, December 8, 1892, in ibid., 295; Wellhausen to Smith, February 10, 1892, in ibid., 296–97; Wellhausen to Herrmann, February 28, 1893, in ibid., 298–99; Wellhausen to Justi, March 5, 1893, in ibid., 301–02; Wellhausen to Justi, March 25, 1893, in ibid., 302–03; Wellhausen to Herrmann, April 19, 1893, in ibid., 303–04; Wellhausen to Justi, May 18, 1893, in ibid., 305–06; Wellhausen to Harnack, August 1, 1893, in ibid., 307–08; Wellhausen to Theodor Mommsen, [May 15, 1896,] in ibid., 343; Wellhausen to Harnack, December 25, 1896, in ibid., 346–47.

[95] See Wellhausen to Smith, March 19, 1892, in ibid., 280, 282; Wellhausen to Smith, May 31, 1892, in ibid., 286, 288; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, January 4, 1889, in ibid., 223–24; Wellhausen to Smend, January 17, 1892, in ibid., 275.

[96] Wellhausen to Schröder, August 11, 1892, in ibid., 290; Wellhausen to Justi, October 26, 1892, in ibid., 292; Wellhausen to Justi, December 8, 1892, in ibid., 294; Wellhausen to Jülicher, January 11, 1899, in ibid., 265.

[97] Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, [June 1883,] in ibid., 122; Wellhausen to Althoff, July 19, 1888, in ibid., 215–16; Wellhausen to Smend, February 28, 1893, in ibid., 292–99; cf. also Wellhausen to Smith, February 6, 1883, in ibid., 117–18.

[98] For Leipzig, see Wellhausen to Justi, September 25, 1899, in ibid., 369–70; Wellhausen to the Limpricht family, September 25, 1899, in ibid., 370–73; Hanisch, *Die Nachfolger der*

For the rest of his days, which reached their end in 1918, Wellhausen stayed in Göttingen, where his body lies today.

1.2 A Flee(t)ing Theologian

The life of Julius Wellhausen exemplifies the kind of personal, professional, and institutional challenges that confronted any would-be orientalist in an age still dominated by the culture and traditions of classical antiquity and Christian theology. As his own career path demonstrates, the borders between faculties of arts and theology may have been quite porous, but betwixt stood boundaries nonetheless, which only grew higher with time. Recent studies on German biblical and orientalist scholarship have devoted themselves to this complex history, which provides a deeper, more textured context for understanding figures like Wellhausen and the theories and practices they embodied. Education in theology, then as now, could encompass any number of divergent motives and different degrees of devotion with various effects. For many, it presented the opportunity for an elevation in social strata; for some, it simply followed family tradition; for still others, it conformed to some perceived calling.[99] Analysis based on courses taken, degrees awarded, and positions held, while helpful, also have the potential to hinder, especially during a time of so much fluctuation. Furthermore, the high stakes involved in an academic career could drive both critics and defenders of theological studies to exaggerate their positions or to refrain from contentious debate altogether. However, a matrix of positions can map the landscape Wellhausen had to negotiate throughout his entire life as a subject to the Kaiser, an officer of the state, a member of the church, and a man of ancient letters.

On one end of the spectrum stood outspoken supporters of the theological enterprise, as represented by Dillmann and Stade. These two may have helmed contrastive courses as they progressed through their careers, yet both took their bearings from (Protestant) theology as a discipline and mode of life. After completing his first exam in theology and spending a short stint in pastoral ministry, Dillmann acquired a Dr. phil. from the University Tübingen (1846).[100] Follow-

Exegeten, 63; University of Göttingen, *Chronik der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1899–1900* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1900), 54.

[99] See Oliver Janz, *Bürger besonderer Art. Evangelische Pfarrer in Preußen, 1850–1914* (Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin 87; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 85–192; idem, "Kirche, Staat und Bürgertum in Preußen. Pfarrhaus und Pfarrerschaft im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert," in *Evangelische Pfarrer. Zur sozialen und politischen Rolle einer bürgerlichen Gruppe in der deutschen Gesellschaft des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts,* ed. Luise Schorn-Schütte and Walter Sparn (Konfession und Gesellschaft 12; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1997), 128–47.

[100] George L. Robinson, "August Dillmann," *The Biblical World* 4 (1894): 244–58; T. Witton Davies, "August Dillmann 1," *The Expository Times* 6 (1895): 202–04; idem, "August Dillmann 2," *The Expository Times* 6 (1895): 248–50; idem, "August Dillmann 3," *The Expository Times*

ing two years' research travel, he returned to the same Faculty of Theology to teach as tutor in the *Tübinger Stift* (1848–51), as private docent (1851–53), and as associate professor (1853–1854) before succeeding Olshausen in the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Kiel (1854–1864), where he advanced to full professor in 1859. Three years later, he received a Doctor of Theology *honoris causa* from Leipzig. In 1864, Dillmann then moved to the Faculty of Theology at the University of Giessen and later to that of Berlin (1869–1894). A member of the next generation and a former pupil of Dillmann's, Stade passed his first exam in theology (1870) and earned a Dr. phil. (1871) before obtaining his licentiate in theology (1873), all degrees from Leipzig.[101] Upon Stade's own call to Giessen, he collected the requisite Dr. theol. (h.c.) from his new institutional home (1875), where he remained the rest of his career.

Despite the names of faculties and letters on degrees, Dillmann and Stade both preserved a deep commitment to theology as science and a power in human society. Dillmann promoted the integration of academic theology and the life of the church as he proclaimed, "Precisely the universities, as the seat of science (*Wissenschaft*), have a high calling also for the furtherance of the churches."[102] In the same way, his posthumous *Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie* exhorted, "Now to generate this very proof of [divine] providence (*Ratschlussmässigkeit*) and necessity – and the inner truth of Christianity – by historical means is the final goal and use of our discipline."[103] In an address from 1883, Stade could simply assert, "Here no one has cast into doubt that what we theologians do is science (*Wissenschaft*), for everyone knows it is done by the same means and with the same method used in all of scholarship. But one does not defend what neither external claim nor internal doubt call[s] into question."[104] The same premise appeared in Stade's *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*.[105] While an historical approach thus legitimized as a science the study of the Old Testament,

6 (1895): 345–52; Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin, "Dillmann, August," in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. 4, *Christiana–Dorothea*, 3rd ed., ed. Albert Hauck (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898), 662–69.

[101] August Freiherr von Gall, "Bernhard Stade. Ein Nachruf," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 27, no. 1 (1907): i–xix.

[102] August Dillmann, *Von der Hochschule und den Hochschulen. Akademische Festrede zur Feier des hohen Geburtstagsfestes Seiner Königlichen Hoheit des Großherzogs Ludwigs III. am 9. Juni 1869* (Giessen: Brühl, 1869), 11, cf. also 12–13; cf. also N.N., "Correspondenzen und Nachrichten," *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung für das evangelische Deutschland* 44 (October 30, 1869): 1055–57, at 1055–56.

[103] August Dillmann, *Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie,* ed. Rudolf Kittel (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1895), 9.

[104] Bernhard Stade, "Ueber die Lage der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands," repr. in idem, *Ausgewählte akademische Reden und Abhandlungen*, 2nd ed. (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1907), 1–36, at 3.

[105] Bernhard Stade, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. 1, *Die Religion Israels und die Entstehung des Judentums* (Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaften 2/2.1; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1905), 15.

the value of these ancient texts to the church secured the status of such study as a specifically theological discipline. Stade and Dillmann, each of whom served as rector of his university, conceptualized theology – as an institutionalized undertaking – as the integral link between the obligations of science and the needs of the Protestant church, which then extended to society more broadly. Yet their position was only one.

Elsewhere, critics could increasingly find – and broadcast – their voice. Apart from Young Hegelian critiques of religion itself, opponents launched a battery of charges against that establishment of theology, as embodied by Franz Overbeck (1837–1905) and de Lagarde. Having studied theology and orientalia in both Berlin and Halle, de Lagarde obtained a *Berliner* Dr. phil. (1849) and *Hallenser* habilitation (1851),[106] the latter supported through the Protestant Secular Stipend of Berlin (*Evangelisches Säkularstipendium der Stadt Berlin*), which promoted work in the faculty of philosophy.[107] Once Berlin had refused to grant him the necessary credentials in theology, he requested and finally collected an honorary licentiate in theology from the University of Erlangen (1852).[108] Years later, in 1868, Halle conferred on him a Dr. theol. h.c., too.[109] Forced to occupy himself with either research stays abroad or teaching school at home – and rather prolific publication all the while – de Lagarde received appointment through the personal intervention of none other than the Kaiser as Ewald's successor for oriental languages in Göttingen's Faculty of Philosophy (1869), a post he held until his death. As for Overbeck, he undertook the study of theology in Leipzig, Göttingen, and later Berlin, earning a Dr. phil. from Leipzig (1860) and procuring his habilitation in Jena (1864), where he first remained as lecturer for New Testament and early church history.[110] In 1870, Jena awarded him the customary

[106] Michael Lattke, *Paul Anton de Lagarde und das Judentum* (St. Lucia, 2014), 13–17; Ludwig Schemann, "Paul de Lagarde. Ein Nachruf," *Bayreuther Blätter* 15, no. 6 (1892): 185–210.

[107] Cf. Anna de Lagarde, *Paul de Lagarde. Erinnerungen aus seinem Leben für die Freunde zusammengestellt*, 1st ed. (Göttingen: Kaestner, 1894), 14. On this *Berliner* stipend and others, see Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, "Studenten, Studium und Lehre," in *Geschichte der Universität unter den Linden*, Vol. 1, *Gründung und Blütezeit der Universität zu Berlin, 1810–1918,* ed. idem and Charles E. McClelland (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012), 209–68, at 221–23.

[108] N.N., "Correspondenz," *Akademische Monatsschrift* (*Deutsche Universitäts-Zeitung*) 4 (February 1852), 75; cf. also Ludwig Schemann, *Paul de Lagarde. Ein Lebens- und Erinnerungsbild*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Matthes, 1920), 90 n. 1; Paul de Lagarde, "Ueber einige Berliner Theologen, und was von ihnen zu lernen ist," in idem, *Mittheilungen,* Vol. 4 (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1891), 49–128, at 82; also printed separately as idem, *Ueber einige Berliner Theologen und was von ihnen zu lernen ist* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1890) [repr. in idem, *Erinnerungen an Friedrich Rückert. Ueber einige Berliner Theologen, und was von ihnen zu lernen ist. Zwei Aufsätze,* ed. Anna de Lagarde (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1897)]. The notice in *Akademische Monatsschrift* referred to Dr. Phil. Bötticher of Halle.

[109] One tribute to de Lagarde mistakenly described the degree as in Catholic theology: Adolph Wahrmund, "Paul de Lagarde," *Bayreuther Blätter* 15, no. 6 (1892): 210–22.

[110] Leopold Zscharnack, "Overbeck, Franz," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 4, *Mi-R*, 2nd ed., ed. Hermann

honorary Doctor of Theology so he could accept a position in Basel, his home for the rest of his life. The next year, Overbeck advanced to full professor, and in 1897, he transitioned to the status of emeritus professor. Before his death, in 1905, the University of St. Andrews awarded him an honorary Doctor of Divinity (D. D.), which he had previously declined, in 1899 – on account of his aversion to theology.[111]

Despite degrees awarded, subjects studied, and training undertaken, de Lagarde and Overbeck ultimately championed the eradication of theological faculties. A controversial figure in almost every respect, de Lagarde found much to criticize in Christian dogma, institutions, and society.[112] As Fritz Stern encapsulates the still greater ambition, "His aim was primarily negative: to clear away the rubble of the past and so prepare the ground for the building of a new national temple."[113] Opening his essay on the relationship between the German state, on the one hand, and theology, church, and religion, on the other, de Lagarde declared, "One can easily conclude that this description of science (*wissenschaft* [*sic*]) is inapplicable to the discipline we in Germany call theology [and] that the theology we actually have is therefore not science."[114] He conceived of proper theology as the mastery of religion in general. Only historical inquiry thus deserved a seat at the university. Ideally, in his view, the state would abolish institutions beholden to confessions – or at least banish them to their sectarian parent organizations, a strategy that would ultimately spell their demise – since their true interest lay in merely maintaining themselves. He judged this concern unfit for the Germany

---

Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1930), 843–44; Hubert Cancik, "Overbeck, Franz Camill," in *Neue Deutsche Biographie,* ed. Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1999), 19:724–25. In the biographic literature, the dates fluctuate about a year for his various periods of study.

[111] N. N., "St Andrews. University News and Notes," *The University Review* 1 (May–September, 1905), 114–15. For the documentation, see Franz Overbeck, *Werke und Nachlaß*, Vol. 7/1, *Autobiographisches "Mich selbst betreffend,"* ed. Marianne Stauffacher-Schaub and Mathias Stauffacher (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2002), Appendix 3: "Briefwechsel mit James Donaldson 1899 und 1903–1905," 286–310; idem, *Werke und Nachlaß*, Vol. 8, *Briefe*, ed. Andreas Urs Sommer, Niklaus Peter, and Frank Bestebreurtje (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2008), 133, 453–56, 518, 522.

[112] On the problematic figure that is Paul de Lagarde, see Fritz Stern's formative *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961); Ulrich Sieg, *Deutschlands Prophet. Paul de Lagarde und die Ursprünge des modernen Antisemitismus* (Munich: Hanser, 2007) [ET: *Germany's Prophet: Paul de Lagarde & the Origins of Modern Antisemitism*, trans. idem and Linda Ann Marianiello (Tauber Institute Series for the Study of European Jewry; Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2013)]; Robert W. Lougee, *Paul de Lagarde, 1827–1891: A Study of Radical Conservatism in Germany* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962); Vincent Viaene, "Paul de Lagarde: A Nineteenth-Century 'Radical' Conservative – and Precursor of National Socialism?," *European History Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (1996): 527–57.

[113] Stern, *Politics of Cultural Despair*, 40.

[114] Paul de Lagarde, *Ueber das verhältnis des deutschen staates zu theologie, kirche und religion. ein versuch nicht-theologen zu orientieren* (*sic*) (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1873), 5 [repr. in idem, *Deutsche Schriften*, 1st ed. (Goettingen [*sic*]: Dieterich, 1878), 5–54].

yet to be.[115] Published the same year and written in response, Overbeck's *Ueber die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie* argued the state should eliminate all faculties of theology (even beyond the walls of the state institutions) and establish a new, non-confessional one at the university for the subject of religion in general, a topic he deemed indispensable to the state.[116] Overbeck, too, denied theology its claim to scientificity. The requirement (still not everywhere abolished) for professors to swear an oath to the church alongside their ostensibly inevitable commitment to specific methods and conclusions, so Overbeck, negated the pretension of theology to science. No one could serve two masters. Irrespective of his lifelong appointment in the Faculty of Theology, which he actually sought to escape, Overbeck "at first instinctively, later and indeed for the greatest part of my professional life voluntarily and fundamentally, renounced the exercise of my [theological] vocation, for I found myself entirely unfit as a representative of Christianity, to which I was, however, externally called."[117] Be it in spite or because of such associations, de Lagarde and Overbeck denied theology as an approach and as a discipline the status of true scholarship and further challenged its right to exist at the university of the state. In this way, they occupied the other end of the spectrum, opposite Dillmann and Stade.

Placed upon this spectrum, Wellhausen gravitated towards de Lagarde and Overbeck. In fact, the former had sent him his statement on church and state, theology and religion upon its publication. Though not entirely at one, Wellhausen did agree with "the most important points" but admitted, "much to my chagrin since I know I am thereby signing my death warrant."[118] He seconded de Lagarde's opprobrium of the Protestant "formal principle" (i. e., *sola scriptura*), agreed with his denunciation of ascribing metaphysical value to contingencies of the past, and further endorsed his censure of educational policies and some strands of political liberalism. However, Wellhausen disagreed with the foundation of a national church. He judged neither a radical separation nor a deep integration as workable solutions to the complex problem at issue. So, too, he later wrote to Smend, "Not the confession but state religion must be opposed. That is

[115] Cf. Lagarde, *Ueber das verhältnis des deutschen staates zu theologie, kirche und religion*, 47–58, cf. 5–7.

[116] Franz Overbeck, *Ueber die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie* (Leipzig: Naumann, 1903), 121, 129–30. On their positions, see Sigurd Hjelde, *Die Religionswissenschaft und das Christentum. Eine historische Untersuchung über das Verhältnis von Religionswissenschaft und Theologie* (Studies in the History of Religion 61; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 87–125; Robert Hanhart, "Paul Anton de Lagarde und seine Kritik an der Theologie," in *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, ed. Bernd Moeller (Göttinger Universitätsschriften A/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 271–305, esp. 300–05; Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany*, 254–55. On their relationship, see Lionel Gossman, *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt: A Study in Unseasonable Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 571 n. 41.

[117] Franz Overbeck, *Christentum und Kultur. Gedanken und Anmerkungen zur modernen Theologie*, ed. Carl Albrecht Bernoulli (Basel: Schwabe, 1919), 288.

[118] Wellhausen to de Lagarde, February 19, 1873, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 19–20.

certainly a very difficult affair."[119] Yet discussion of said affair in any open setting proved somewhat unseemly to him, so much so that he declined the invitation by historian and politician Hans Delbrück (1848–1929) to contribute theological material to the *Preußische Jahrbücher* – an elite, influential periodical of culture and politics that bore the marks of national liberalism. Wellhausen thus penned his publisher in 1886,

> But my theology does not fit with the politics of the Jahrbücher; it does not suit me at all that religion and theology are essentially judged as means for politics. Religion, esp[ecially] the Protestant confession, now admittedly eats from the hand of the state in Prussia indeed; yet this is no situation that I consider normal. However, I have absolutely no desire to let my *practical* thoughts be printed; I already have enough to do with the publication of the theoretical.[120]

In matters of personal religion and national politics, he mostly kept his views to himself and that small circle of confidants with whom he had regular exchanges. More than most, perhaps, Wellhausen experienced just how delicate the equilibrium truly was between the church (both Protestant and Catholic) and state in Imperial Germany along with the implications of that delicate balancing act for the university in general and the study of a contentious ancient past in particular.

By contrast, he leaned away from the likes of Dillmann and Stade. Now, others surely upheld positions more conservative still. The former's predecessor in Berlin, Ernst Hengstenberg (1802–1869), for example, rejected "higher criticism" altogether and enjoyed an institutional power that enabled him to fight against it long and hard.[121] Dillmann did advance the cause of historical inquiry into the biblical texts.[122] As he also proclaimed in his rector's address, "A church that cannot bear the light of scholarship or first must soften it with various colored glasses would have to be laid among the dead."[123] Like him, Stade devoted himself to

---

[119] Cf. Wellhausen to Smend, February 26, 1892, in ibid., 277–78, at 278.

[120] Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, [ca. January 1886,] in ibid., 190–91, italics original.

[121] See Matthias A. Deuschle, *Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des kirchlichen Konservatismus im Preußen des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); see also Henning Graf Reventlow, *Epochen der Bibelauslegung,* Vol. 4, *Von der Aufklärung bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Beck, 2001) [ET: *History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol. 4, *From the Enlightenment to the Twentieth Century*, trans. Leo G. Perdue (Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 63; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 286–98]; Rudolf Smend, "A Conservative Approach in Opposition to a Historical-critical Investigation: E. W. Hengstenberg and Franz Delitzsch," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 494–520.

[122] For an excellent, early account of Dillmann's various theses, see Robinson, "August Dillmann"; cf. also Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments,* 2nd ed. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), esp. 374–75.

[123] Cf. August Dillmann, *Ueber die Theologie als Universitätswissenschaft. Rede beim Antritt des Rectorats der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin am 15. October 1875* (Berlin: Vogt, 1875); cf. also Max Lenz, *Rede zum Antritt des Rektorates der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Berlin gehalten in der Aula am 15. Oktober 1911* (Berlin: Schade

science. This self-proclaimed "representative of theology" may have considered "biblical theology" the ultimate end of Old Testament scholarship, but he actually scooped Wellhausen's unhurried *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* with his own exhaustive *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, which ignited the ire of Wellhausen.[124] Despite their common allegiance to critical study of an ancient past conveyed in the biblical texts, Wellhausen conceptualized the boundaries between philology and theology, between science and religion, in a very different manner.

The circulation between faculties of arts and of theology may have been unremarkable for many, but for Wellhausen the rush from one to the other was indeed remarkable – and remarked upon.[125] An editorial note in *The Hebrew Student* asserted, "… Theology has been abandoned for Philology, pure and simple."[126] The question naturally arises as to what it was he left behind and why. Several months earlier, in 1882, Wellhausen had broached to the Ministry of Culture his appeal from two years prior and explained his rather awkward position, claiming a certain ignorance from the start:

> I became a theologian because the scientific treatment of the Bible interested me; only gradually did I come to realize that a professor of theology at the same time has the practical task of preparing the students for service in the Protestant church and that I am not sufficient for this practical task, [but that I] on the contrary – despite all my own restraint – make my listeners even unfit for their office.[127]

On the one hand, Wellhausen viewed the Old Testament as an historical and philological problem – and therein lay his interest. As an early-career academic, the semitist reportedly jotted inside the cover of a different work his idea

---

[Francke], 1911), 20–22; see, too, Charles E. McClelland, "Öffentlicher Raum und politische Kultur," in *Geschichte der Universität unter den Linden*, Vol. 1, *Gründung und Blütezeit der Universität zu Berlin*, 1810–1918, ed. Tenorth and McClelland, 567–636, at 585.

[124] For more on Stade's stance, see "Ueber die Lage der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands," in idem, *Ausgewählte akademische Reden*, 3; idem, "Ueber die Aufgaben der biblischen Theologie des Alten Testaments," in ibid.; see further Hermann Spieckermann, "Das neue Bild der Religionsgeschichte Israels – eine Herausforderung der Theologie?," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 105 (2008): 259–80; idem, "'YHWH Bless You and Keep You': The Relation of History of Israelite Religion and Old Testament Theology Reconsidered," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 23, no. 2 (2009): 165–82. For the controversial reorganization of his faculty, see Stade's own account: Stade, *Die Reorganisation der Theologischen Fakultät zu Gießen in den Jahren 1878 bis 1882, Thatsachen, nicht Legende. Eine Streitschrift wider Nippold und Genossen* (Giessen: Ricker, 1894); see further Rudolf Smend, "Eine neue Fakultät für eine neue Theologie. Gießen 1877–1882," in idem, *Zwischen Mose und Karl Barth. Akademische Vorträge* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 159–69; Christian Nottmeier, *Adolf von Harnack und die deutsche Politik 1890–1930. Eine biographische Studie zum Verhältnis von Protestantismus, Wissenschaft und Politik*, 1st ed. (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 124; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 88–91.

[125] Further to this transition, see Smend, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 167–76; cf. idem, "Ein Fakultätswechsel. Julius Wellhausen und die Theologe," in idem, *Zwischen Mose und Karl Barth*, 274–300, at 284–86.

[126] Harper, "Editorial Notes. Wellhausen," 27.

[127] Wellhausen to the Ministry of Culture, April 5, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 98–99.

for a book project whose title read, "Concerning the Extraction, Separation, Investigation, and Systematic Presentation of the Religious Contents of the Old Testament. An Attempt at Critique of the So-Called Old Testament Theology as a Scientific Discipline."[128] Later, once in Marburg, Wellhausen extolled the forays by philologists like the distinguished Hermann Usener (1834–1905) into the traditional domains controlled by theologians; he communicated an interest of his own in the endeavor, expressing his desire to participate, but alluded to the "moral reasons" that prevented him from undertaking such pursuits and holding him within the field of Arabic.[129] For Wellhausen, "theology" and "philology" belonged together. *Per contra*, he penned to Smith, a friend of like mind and experience, "So often, these damned philologists do not pay proper attention to the matters. That comes with the separation of philology and history, from philology and theology. It is an unholy divorce."[130] Likewise, in the preface to the first edition of his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* – dedicated in reciprocity to Wilamowitz for the latter's inscription to him in *Homerische Untersuchungen,* of 1884 – Wellhausen stressed the centrality of Judaism for understanding the ancient past and further stated progress on the subject could only come through greater interaction between theology and philology as well as philology and theology.[131] In this way, the analysis of sacred scripture with the tools of textual science animated his imagination.

On the other hand, Wellhausen had an outright aversion to theology as a constellation of institutions, an organized force in society, and a structure of theoretical reflection. "University theology," he reminded Althoff, "seemed to me an impossible compromise between science and church …."[132] This antipathy had surfaced early on. In a letter to Dillmann dated 1875, Wellhausen confessed, "Even I believe that science can do something to renew the church; but I hate the

[128] Rudolf Smend, "Theologie im Alten Testament," in *Verifikationen. Festschrift für Gerhard Ebeling zum 70. Geburtstag,* ed. Eberhard Jüngel, Johannes Wallmann, and Wilfrid Werbeck (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1982), 11–26, at 12 [repr. in idem, *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments* (Gesammelte Studien 1; Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 99; Munich: Beck, 1986), 104–17]. Later, Wellhausen did assert theology could be scientific: see, e. g., Wellhausen to Mommsen, May 1, 1902, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 406; Wellhausen to Harnack, June 4, 1902, in ibid., 408.

[129] Wellhausen to Usener, November 2, 1886, in ibid., 201; cf. Wellhausen to Pernice, July 15, 1894, in ibid., 318–19; Wellhausen to Socin, May 12, 1882, in ibid., 101–02.

[130] Wellhausen to Smith, May 1, 1889, in ibid., 226–27; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, February 10, 1893, in ibid., 296–97; Wellhausen to Eduard Schwartz, [February 19, 1905,] in ibid., 447; see. also Wellhausen to the Göttingen Faculty of Philosophy, June 1, 1894, in ibid., 314–15.

[131] Julius Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte,* 1st ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1894), v, in a foreword not reprinted in subsequent editions; cf. also the stance of Eduard Norden: Kurt Rudolph, "Eduard Nordens Bedeutung für die frühchristliche Religionsgeschichte, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der 'Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule,'" in *Eduard Norden (1868–1941). Ein deutscher Gelehrter jüdischer Herkunft,* ed. Bernhard Kytzler, Kurt Rudolph, and Jörg Rüpke (Palingenesia 49; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994), 83–105, at 84. Unless otherwise noted, citation of *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* refers to the seventh edition, of 1914.

[132] Wellhausen to Althoff, February 12, 1886, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 192.

direct application of so-called science onto life in the way that [Otto] Pfleiderer or [Heinrich] Holtzmann do it, for example. But in order that science *might influence* life, it must be science first and foremost and be consistent with its own concepts."[133] Accordingly, he claimed Ewald's 1825 work on the meter of Arabic poetry, *De metris carminum Arabicorum*, had done more to regenerate the church "than everything that Pfleiderer and Holtzmann have written with the direct connection of science to religion."[134] (However, he did maintain the work of theologians could prove – at least in theory – to be scientific, an opinion that placed him in opposition to Mommsen.[135]) In the same vein, Wellhausen explained to Olshausen he found abhorrent (*verhaßt*) not the Old Testament itself – so long as he disregarded half its books – but rather his own standing in relation to those texts as directed by his post in a faculty of theology.[136] This desire for distance impacted his choices in both topics and venues for publication. As he announced to Abraham Kuenen (1828–1891), the theological journals "disgusted" him already at an early stage, and he avoided writing in them altogether.[137] In equal measure, Wellhausen eschewed subjects of research that might fall within the purview of "theology," which accounted for his decision not to work on Aramaic Jewish literature, specifically an edition of the "Jerusalem Targum."[138] He abstained from all appearance of compromise. Comparing his own situation in Prussia to that of Smith in Scotland, who had hoped to change the church from within, Wellhausen admitted, "I do not care about my church, that is the difference; therefore I voluntarily resign from my public office, which stands in relationship to the church. I do not believe in the possibility of reanimating the stinking corpse that is called the orthodox or even the liberal German Protestant church."[139] If Wellhausen felt that science, including the science of antiquity, could, in the end, have some bearing on the modern world – or, more particularly, the individuals who inhabited it – he thought the dots of faith could, perhaps, be plotted but the lines between them should be left undrawn. The orientalist's

[133] Wellhausen to Dillmann, December 18, 1875, in ibid., 31–32; see further Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 17, 1872, in ibid., 11–12; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, December 16, 1894, in ibid., 325; cf. also Wellhausen to Herrmann, January 20, 1891, in ibid., 264.

[134] Ibid.

[135] See Wellhausen to Harnack, June 4, 1902, in ibid., 408; cf. Wellhausen to Mommsen, April 27, 1902, in ibid., 206; Wellhausen to Mommsen, May 1, 1902, ibid.

[136] Wellhausen to Olshausen, February 9, 1879, in ibid., 55–56; cf. also Wellhausen to Socin, May 12, 1882, in ibid., 101–02; Wellhausen to Althoff, December 18, 1884, in ibid., 159–60.

[137] Wellhausen to Kuenen, July 10, 1875, in ibid., 30–31. Though by no means his most frequented venues, he did publish in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, *The New World: A Quarterly Review of Religion Ethics and Theology*: cf. also Wellhausen to Olshausen, March 25, 1872, in ibid., 9.

[138] Wellhausen to Olshausen, February 18, 1879, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 57–58.

[139] Wellhausen to Smith, [October 1881,] in ibid., 94–95, at 95. He continued, "In England things are different and better – I believe it would be very very difficult for me to resign."

hostility to such a theological apparatus thus drove him away. So it was that he – in his own words – "quit theology."[140]

Such aversion notwithstanding, Wellhausen lived and died a man of faith – but not a theologian. However, Wilamowitz did contend, "Wellhausen always remained a Christian …. He also remained a theologian; this explains the entire approach of his [Israelite] history."[141] Indeed, his putative identity as a confessed Christian, theologian, and even *Göttinger* has long attracted comment but seen perhaps a rather disproportionate defense, especially by members of Protestant confessions, of theological faculties, and/or of the University of Göttingen. Representing this common attempt to rehabilitate Wellhausen as a proper theologian, Rudolf Smend, asseverates – and not without conviction – "Only someone blinded by foolishness or intent (*Vorsatz*) can read the first volume of *Geschichte Israels* … as an untheological book. It is full of theology."[142] Yet the most immediate question is Wellhausen's own intent. Certainly, almost anything under the sun could undergo a "theological" reading, that is, an analysis for embedded metaphysical claims or a colonization for use in others' projects aimed beyond the material realm. Though theologizable, his work was not theology – at least in his own description. When Wellhausen did speak on that problematically polysemous word, he most often referred to either a foreign or a former sphere of activity. No matter how much theology in the sense of belief in the divine may have shaped the life he led, the questions he asked, the methods he used, and the institutions he inhabited, such concern was only indirect. Any effort in this regard would have been *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* at the very best: sketches and spadework.[143] If Wellhausen did perceive his labors in the history of ancient texts as necessary (but alone insufficient) steps toward answering greater questions of god and world – a claim as yet unproved – the documentation is far from ample. This general silence on the matter should come as no surprise, however.

---

[140] See Wellhausen to Smith, May 11, 1882, in ibid., 100–01; Wellhausen to Socin, May 12, 1882, in ibid., 101–02; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, May 1, 1884, in ibid., 146–47; Wellhausen to Althoff, February 12, 1886, in ibid., 192; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, December 16, 1894, in ibid., 325; cf. Wellhausen to Alfred Pernice, July 15, 1894, in ibid., 318–19.

[141] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen*, 189. On the relationship between Wilamowitz and Wellhausen, see Rudolf Smend, "Der Alttestamentler Julius Wellhausen und Wilamowitz," in *Wilamowitz in Greifswald. Akten der Tagung zum 150. Geburtstag Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs in Greifswald, 19–22. Dezember 1998,* ed. William M. Calder, III, et al. (Hildesheim: Olms, 2000), 197–215; idem, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 150–51; see further Momigliano, "Religious History Without Frontiers."

[142] Smend, "Ein Fakultätswechsel," 282; cf. also, e. g., idem, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 167–72, esp. 171 n. 138; Lothar Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen. Geschichtsphilosophische Voraussetzungen und historiographische Motive für die Darstellung der Religion und Geschichte Israels durch Wilhelm Vatke und Julius Wellhausen* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 94; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1965), 229–43.

[143] Cf. p. 110 below.

Religion in its highest form, for Wellhausen, was a personal affair. His reflections on the subject became most manifest in his private correspondence with Smith as well as his in-laws, Charlotte (1832–1907) and Heinrich (1827–1909) Limpricht. These letters oft displayed a more intimate piety, be it enhanced performance or intimate revelation.[144] As he confided to his British friend, around 1881, "Religion is, indeed, also what *unites* people; but the antecedent (*das Prius*), it seems to me, is the entirely personal and individual relationship to God."[145] This internal aspect, nay, quintessence, directed Wellhausen's thoughts on the training of young pastors. Amid the *Apostolikumsstreit*, a heated controversy over the Apostles' Creed, he resisted the notion that an inner religious world could be constructed from without:

> This entire course of theol[ogical] study is despicable; one cannot aim a course of study at the formation (*Bildung*) of a religious conviction. One can study only very simple things, Greek, mathematics, and s[o] f[orth]. Everything else must grow, [it] cannot be forced. Through this ignorance of what studying actually is, the entire time at university gets lost for the theologians. It would be best if they all studied philology, became teachers or whatever, and then, when they were 50 years old and [if they] had desire, pastors.[146]

This sentiment extended beyond the formal study of theology or the education of clergy, to his reflections on religion in modern society more broadly. Such commentary, however, emerged not in his private correspondence but an academic work of ancient history, from this author otherwise unfavorably disposed to discussing such matters in public. In a sketch on the history of Israel, Wellhausen praised the gospel for promoting a religious individualism. He then launched into a homily of sorts:

> … every formation of a religious community is a step towards the secularisation of religion; the religion of the heart alone remains an inward thing. […] [I]f the Church has

---

[144] On the relationship between Wellhausen and Smith, see Bernhard Maier's invaluable *William Robertson Smith. His Life, his Work and his Times* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 1/67; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009); see also Rudolf Smend, "William Robertson Smith and Julius Wellhausen," in *William Robertson Smith: Essays in Reassessment,* ed. William Johnstone (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 226–42.

[145] Wellhausen to Smith, [August/September 1881,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 89, italics original; cf. also Wellhausen to Smith, [October 1881,] in ibid., 93–95; Wellhausen to Smith, [beginning of 1882,] in ibid., 96–97; Wellhausen to Smith, November 7, 1889, in ibid., 237–38; see further pp. 310 below.

[146] Wellhausen to Smith, February 10, 1893, in ibid., 296–97, at 297; cf. also Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 28, 1874, in ibid., 24–25. In a curious letter to an unknown addressee, Wellhausen submitted a similar argument: "One thing is clear: the class[ical] education is aristocratic and no religion; the natural-scientific one, when popularized, has in the best case a neutral effect. What we have lost, something holy that unites everything equally, cannot be *made*. It certainly does not arise from science, even from philosophy. Rather in the womb of social democracy, if ever a positive spirit emerges there and smashes the present idols of this society to pieces" (Wellhausen to an unknown recipient, March 21, 1906, in ibid., 479, italics original).

still a task, it is that of preparing an inner unity of practical conviction, and awakening a sentiment, first in small circles, that we belong to each other.[147]

At the end of the passage, he closed with a still more revealing assertion: "The religious individualism of the Gospel is, and must remain for all time, the true salt of the earth."[148] Just as Wellhausen's volume on Israelite and Jewish history expanded an earlier sketch he had offered in his essay "Israel," so also the book enlarged such sermonizing. In its corresponding chapter, on the gospel, he pondered the relationship between the individual and collective, on the one hand, and between religion and society, on the other:

> Faith in freedom and faith in God is the same thing, one not without the other. Both are only present in faith; but faith is not obtained by force but is certainty. […] Public religion does not have to cease. But Jesus did not found the church, he passed judgment on the Jewish theocracy. The gospel is only the salt of the earth: where it aims to be more, it is less. It preaches the noblest individualism, the freedom of the children of God.[149]

Here, too, he considered religion, in its essence, a personal concern. Such an understanding therefore warranted his statement, submitted to Friedrich Spitta (1852–1924), that the truth of the gospel lay neither in ethics nor in an historical figure but rather in faith alone.[150]

The semitist's reluctance to characterize his own work as theology or to meditate on any potential significance for grander questions of the same resulted, at least in part, from this notion of (true) Christianity as a private, internal matter. His digression on current affairs of private faith and public life – all the more in a book on the ancient past – proved exceptional. Indeed, Wellhausen may, perhaps, have seen poetic or moral truths within the biblical texts, whatever the historical complexities involved, but as Marchand has written, for him "… these sorts of truth were not only problematical – for they could not be proved – but also rather too embarrassing to discuss publicly."[151] She continues:

---

[147] Julius Wellhausen, "Israel," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., Vol. 13 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881), 396–432 [repr. in idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, with a reprint of the article "Israel" from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies, with a preface by William Robertson Smith (Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885), 427–548, at 512–13; published separately as *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1891)], citation refers to the reprint in *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* unless otherwise noted; cf. also his critique of de Lagarde's proposal (Wellhausen to de Lagarde, February 19, 1873, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 19–20). The two reprints of "Israel" included an appendix from *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 1.1, *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's*, entitled "Judaism and Christianity," however, which contained this particular quotation, meaning it did not feature in the original publication, as an encyclopedia entry.

[148] Wellhausen, "Israel," 513.

[149] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 371; cf. also Smend, "Wellhausen in Greifswald," 170–71; see further Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 17, 1872, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 11–12; Wellhausen to Herrmann, April 21, 1915, in ibid., 633.

[150] Wellhausen to Friedrich Spitta, October 8, 1885, in ibid., 185–86.

[151] Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 179.

We have to do, here, with not just a postromantic but even an antiromantic generation, one which for [*sic*] professing scientific theology meant to have one's philological ducks in order – especially at a time in which fundamental questions about the integrity and chronology of biblical texts were being debated more intensively and extensively than ever before.

Wellhausen, who much preferred to study than profess, devoted himself to these ancient texts with an indefatigable zeal. In correspondence with Dillmann, he had distilled "the basic condition of Christianness" as "religious fervor, work in itself, and the capacity for self-sacrifice."[152] Likewise, in published work he depicted self-denial as "the chief demand of the Gospel."[153] In fact, *Wissenschaft*, too, he characterized as "self-sacrifice" most of all.[154] The pursuit of the ancient past, for no sake but its own, became a kind of ersatz religion for Wellhausen. It was a calling that consumed him.

1.3 An Ascetic Scholarship

The religious fervor with which Wellhausen inspected ancient texts but against which he fought in their interpretation proceeded from his understanding of scholarship. When Hans Liebeschütz referred to Wellhausen's "almost ascetic conceptualization of science," however, he was calling attention to yet a different dimension: the pursuit of knowledge independent of any popular movement or public opinion.[155] In this age, marked as it was by an ever proliferating specialization and booming professionalization, the scholars of mid-century founded what Thomas Nipperdey has called a "religion of science."[156] Building on this insight together with others by Charles McClelland, Howard has further scrutinized the industrial complex of scientific theology, fueled in no small part by a sense of duty and calling:

The development of the new ideal of *Wissenschaft*, deeply rooted in neo-humanist ideas and in quasi-Romantic notions of the power of human intelligence and creativity, had two principle characteristics: (1) the elevation of scholarly work to a form of moral obligation, and (2) a belief in the insufficiency of past forms of knowledge, and confidence in the individual scholar to improve and create new knowledge.[157]

---

[152] Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 17, 1872, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 11–12.

[153] Wellhausen, "Israel," 510.

[154] Wellhausen to Dillmann, December 18, 1875, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 31–32; cf. also Wellhausen to Herrmann, April 21, 1915, in ibid., 633.

[155] Hans Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber* (Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 17; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1967), 250.

[156] Cf. Thomas Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte, 1800–1866. Bürgerwelt und starker Staat* (Munich: Beck, 1983), 445–46, 496.

[157] Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism*, 103.

Wellhausen conformed to this ideal. The kingdom he sought to build – namely, that of collective (and collected) knowledge – was indeed not of this world but a future one, when all available data had been discovered, sources gathered, texts edited, and evidence at the ready. It was science for the sake of science, but with an almost moral obligation.

By the end of his career, Wellhausen had amassed many marks of distinction. The professorships he declined and the honorary doctorates he accepted – from Edinburgh and Greifswald, not to mention the one from Cambridge he could not – all bear testimony to such repute. His membership to elite scientific organizations attest this stature as well. In 1892, Wellhausen entered the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen upon his return, as professor.[158] (However, he withdrew on March 5, 1903, given his trouble hearing – although he quickly saw himself elected honorary member only four days later, on March 9, 1903 – which accounts for the chronicles' relative silence on any active engagement from him.) In 1900, Adolf Harnack (1851–1930) endorsed Wellhausen as a corresponding member of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences at Berlin.[159] That same year, he delivered a speech to commemorate the Kaiser's birthday, even if he privately showed small joy in the venture.[160] Beginning in 1905, Wellhausen also became a corresponding member of the Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters.[161] Furthermore, he made his way into the upper echelons of government and civil recognition. The increasingly noted philologist offered numerous expert opinions – as well as unsolicited ones – to officials at the Ministry of Culture, and he submitted untold assessments for appointment proceedings. In 1899,

[158] Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1903* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1904), 4; cf. Perlitt, "Julius Wellhausen," 268.

[159] For Harnack's letter of endorsement, see Christa Kirsten, ed., *Die Altertumswissenschaften an der Berliner Akademie. Wahlvorschläge zur Aufnahme von Mitgliedern von F. A. Wolf bis zu G. Rodenwaldt, 1799–1932* (Studien zur Geschichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR 5; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985), 121. On Wellhausen's dubious support of Harnack for the Order *Pour le Mérite*, see Wellhausen to Mommsen, May 1, 1902, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 406; Wellhausen to Harnack, June 4, 1902, in ibid., 408.

[160] University of Göttingen, *Chronik der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1899–1900*, 54; cf. Wellhausen to Justi, December 12, 1899, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 376–77. The address was published as *Ein Gemeinwesen ohne Obrigkeit. Rede zur Feier des Geburtstages Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs am 27. Januar 1900 im Namen der Georg-Augusts-Universität* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1900) and translated as "Tribal Life of the Epic Period," in *The Historians' History of the World: A Comprehensive Narrative of the Rise and Development of Nations as Recorded by Over Two Thousand of the Great Writers of All Ages*, ed. Henry Smith Williams, Vol. 8, *Parthians, Sassenids, and Arabs; the Crusades and the Papacy* (New York: Hooper & Jackson, 1909), 284–93 – a translation apparently absent from the full bibliography listed in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, cf. 830, 837.

[161] Cf. "12. F. Lærde og Oplysning fremmende Selskaber, samt Institutioner til Kunstens, Industriens, Vindskibelighedens, Arbejdsomhedens, Agerbrugets, Fiskeriets m.m. Fremme," in *Kongelig Dansk Hof- og Statskalender Statshaandbog for Kongeriget Danmark for Aaret 1905* (Copenhagen: Hennings, 1905), 877.

he climbed to the rank of privy government councillor.[162] Soon afterwards, the ancient historian was inducted into the civilian class of Prussia's highest order of merit – namely, *Pour le Mérite für Wissenschaften und Künste* – which bestowed upon its members the title Knight (*Ritter*).[163] In 1906, Wellhausen even reached the Prussian Royal Order of the Crown (third class).[164]

These accomplishments often eclipse a different element of Wellhausen's persona: that of the outsider. For instance, he railed against the academic culture in Göttingen. This alumnus saved especial derision for the Society of Sciences, which he regarded as an "antediluvian" institution.[165] The year he returned to his *alma mater*, Wellhausen wrote Smith, "It would be better for such an old rusty kettle to stay unmended. Why do we need such academies of general science!"[166] Not only did he criticize the Society's expenditures on non-specialist publications, but he also ridiculed its "impotence and insignificance," which he attributed to financial bungles and overall impecuniosity, together with the pomp he perceived in the organization's higher levels.[167] In terms of his activity within the University itself, Wellhausen did serve on administrative committees and helped

[162] University of Göttingen, *Chronik der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1899–1900*, 13.

[163] University of Göttingen, *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1901* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1902), 27. (Until the fiscal year 1901, the title ran *Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*.) This award astonished a reporter for *The New York Times*: "Great surprise has been created by the granting by Emperor William of the Prussian Order for Merit to Prof. Julius Wellhausen. The surprise is due to the fact that Prof. Wellhausen is the most radical of German Biblical critics and politically an extreme Leftist" (N. N., "Kaiser Decorates a Biblical Critic," *New York Times* [June 27, 1901]: 2). The remark may say more about American politics than Prussian ones. Indeed, Schwartz described an ever stronger political conservatism in Wellhausen's life that had compensated for the lost religious one of his youth, further stating, "Though he never joined a party, he always retained a certain sympathy for everything on the right" (Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 52).

[164] University of Göttingen, *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1905* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1906), 14.

[165] Wellhausen to Justi, March 5, 1893, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 301–02 (*societas literaria antediluviana*); Wellhausen to Justi, March 25, 1893, in ibid., 302–03 (*societas antediluviana Gottingensis*). Offering a more gracious reading, Perlitt has characterized such mockery as affectionate (*liebevoll*) (idem, "Julius Wellhausen," 268) – a rather generous interpretation also evident in Walther Zimmerli's attempt to blunt such criticism: cf. idem, "Tätigkeitsbericht für das Jahr 1976," in *Jahrbuch der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen für das Jahr 1976* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 7–18, at 11–14. In a similar fashion, Smend has sought to defang Wellhausen's often biting remarks on the University of Göttingen: cf., e. g., idem, "Julius Wellhausen," in idem, *From Astruc to Zimmerli*, 99.

[166] Wellhausen to Smith, November 6, 1892, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 293; cf. also Wellhausen to Smith, [mid August 1893,] in ibid., 309–10.

[167] Cf. Wellhausen to Justi, May 18, 1893, in ibid., 305–06, at 306; Wellhausen to Justi, March 5, 1893, in ibid., 301–02; Wellhausen to Justi, March 25, 1893, in ibid., 302–03; Wellhausen to Robert Vischer, October 29, 1901, in ibid., 403–04; see also Wellhausen to Nöldeke, July 11, 1901, in ibid., 399–400; Wellhausen to Justi, December 23, 1899, in ibid., 376–77; Wellhausen to Paul Wendland, May 15, 1898, in ibid., 356–57; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, October 19, 1901, in ibid., 402.

found the department (*Seminar*) of oriental philology and general linguistics; however, such service, when compared to that of other operators in academia, was underwhelming in quality and quantity alike.[168] This senior member of the University built no school of his own making, directed few dissertations, and showed little desire to mentor. Throughout his private correspondence, Wellhausen often offered variations on a simple theme: "I do not crave professorships. I prefer to write than teach."[169] Despite his own refrain of wanting more time and space to work, he lambasted the local academic culture, kvetching that all work and no play made his colleagues dull boys.[170]

Even more, he carried this distanced disposition with him onto the international stage. The orientalist disliked the more enterprising side of science both at home and abroad. Wellhausen did consider attending the International Congress of Orientalists in Leiden for 1883 ("the Leiden Jewish School," as he called it) and weighed delivering a lecture at the London one in 1892 (on which he remarked, "I am only afraid the Jews will also celebrate with us in 1892. There are admittedly good Jews as well"), but he graced neither with his presence.[171] In fact, he judged

[168] For administrative capacities, see University of Göttingen, *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1902*, 3; idem, *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1903*, 3; idem, *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1904* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1905), 3; cf. also Wellhausen to Vischer, October 29, 1901, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 403–04. For the seminar's establishment, see University of Göttingen, *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1901*, 44–45; cf. idem, *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1902*, 37–38.

[169] Wellhausen to Smith, January 4, 1889, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 223–24; cf. also Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, [post-May 17, 1896,] in ibid., 339–40.

[170] Wellhausen to Herrmann, February 28, 1893, in ibid., 298–99; Wellhausen to Justi, March 5, 1893, in ibid., 301–02; cf. Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, [post-May 17, 1896,] in ibid., 339–40; Wellhausen to Smith, October 6, 1892, in ibid., 291–92.

[171] For the Leiden comment, see Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, August 6, 1883, in ibid., 128–29; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, November 10, 1882, in ibid., 111–12; Wellhausen to Smith, June 29, 1883, in ibid., 123–24. For the London/Oxford remark, see Wellhausen to Smith, December 12, 1890, in ibid., 261–62; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, June 5, 1890, in ibid., 256–67. Wellhausen's name does not appear in the list of participants – or even members – of the London conference (cf. *Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists*, ed. Delmar Morgan, 2 vols. [London: Ballantyne, Hanson & Co., 1893], 1:xiv–xix) nor in that of the Leiden congress (cf. N. N., *Actes du sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes, tenu en 1883 à Leide*, 4 vols. [Leiden: Brill, 1884], 1:11–12). On the Leiden meeting more generally, see [Willem Otterspeer], "Introduction," in *Leiden Oriental Connections, 1850–1940*, ed. Willem Otterspeer (Studies in the History of Leiden University 5; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 1–6. As for the "good Jews," Wellhausen did, at times, express positive sentiment towards Jewish scholars. He reported on a visit to the *Bibliothèque nationale* in Paris, "The keeper, Mr [Hermann] Zotenberg, a baptized Jew and frenchified German, is very friendly towards me; I have even been at his at midday even though he is unmarried" (Wellhausen to Kuenen, July 1880, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 71, 73, at 73; cf. also Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, June 23, 1880, in ibid., 70; Wellhausen to Kuenen, [July 1880,] in ibid., 70–71; Wellhausen to Jülicher, June 1, 1886, in ibid., 196–97). Much later, towards the end of his life, he also wrote to Littmann, "[Mark] Lidzbarski scared and wrongfully misled me with his appearance. Now, he has completely won me over with his substantial reviews in the

such conferences a "scam" (*Schwindel*) – the same verdict he gave to "everything international."[172] (This general opinion diverged from that implied in the warm congratulations he offered Smith upon the latter's appointment to a new position: "I like Cambridge better than Oxford; more English memories may be attached to Oxford, but the cosmopolitan ones of science are attached to Cambridge."[173]) As Wellhausen remarked, "In summer, he [sc. Felix Klein (1849–1925)] hopes to go to Chicago – I would rather go to hell."[174] His visit to the 1894 International Congress of Orientalists in Geneva thus proved quite unusual.[175] Although Wellhausen was awarded an honorary membership to the American Oriental Society (1902) and another one to the Society of Biblical Literature (1913), he published in neither's organ. He ridiculed the "terrible" (*schreckliche*) Americans, who not only crowded his home but also demanded publications and pictures from him.[176] True, the semitist did participate in the Polychrome (or Rainbow) Bible, a project launched by German transplant to the United States Paul Haupt (1858–1926), but the impetus was far from any prospect for synergetic collaboration with the global community of scholars: instead, Wellhausen wanted to discard himself of old material he had written lest it fall to the hands of an editor after he had died.[177] By the same token, honoraria supplied the motivation for his work on the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, whereas translation of his own labors into other languages exerted little pull upon him.[178] Wellhausen, in the

---

DLZ (especially as regards Sachau). He is, by the way, no *schoolboy* but a *young man*. I have also named him, alongside you, among the candidates for my successor," (Wellhausen to Littmann, September 6, 1913, in ibid., 608–09, with the italics original, being a paronomasia between Yiddish and Hebrew, respectively). Littmann would succeed Wellhausen at Göttingen; Lidzbarski, later Littmann. On anti-Semitism and Wellhausen's work, see pp. 120 n. 230 below.

[172] Wellhausen to Smith, June 5, 1890, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 256–67; Wellhausen to Smith, May 31,1892, in ibid., 286–88.

[173] Wellhausen to Smith, January 12, 1883, in ibid.,114–15. Further to the appointment, see Maier, *William Robertson Smith*, 215–30.

[174] Wellhausen to Smith, May 4, 1893, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 304–05.

[175] See N. N., *Actes du dixième Congrès International des Orientalistes. Session de Genève, 1894,* 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1897), 1:17; cf. Wellhausen to the Ministry of Culture, July 2, 1894, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 317. The prewar congress series follows: 1. Paris (1873), 2. London (1874), 3. St. Petersburg (1876), 4. Florence (1878), 5. Berlin (1881), 6. Leiden (1883), 7. Vienna (1886), 8. Stockholm/Christiana (1889), 9. London (1892), 10. Geneva (1894), 11. Paris (1897), 12. Rome (1899), 13. Hamburg (1902), 14. Algiers (1905), 15. Copenhagen (1908), and 16. Athens (1912); after the First World War, the conference did not reconvene again until 1928, in (17.) Oxford. See further Donald Malcolm Reid, "Egyptology under Khedive Ismail: Mariette, al-Tahtawi, and Brugsch, 1850–82," in *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible,* ed. Steven W. Holloway (Hebrew Bible Monographs 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007), 139–85, at 178–83.

[176] Wellhausen to Smith, May 31, 1892, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 287–88.

[177] Wellhausen to Smith, March 19, 1892, in ibid., 280–82; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, May 31, 1892, in ibid., 286–88; see also idem, "Bemerkungen zu den Psalmen," in idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.2, *Verschiedenes* (Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 163–87, at 163.

[178] Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, January 12, 1883, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 113–14; Wellhausen to Mommsen, January 12, 1881, in ibid., 80; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, November 27, 1894, in ibid., 324; cf., e. g., Wellhausen to Smith, December 12, 1883, in ibid., 138; Wellhau-

same vein, first refused collaboration on the *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik*, founded by Althoff and edited by Paul Hinneberg (1862–1934), asserting, "I cannot popularize," and expressing his dislike for those involved, namely, philosopher Eugen Kühnemann (1868–1946) and classicist Hermann Diels (1848–1922).[179] (However, once retitled as a monthly periodical, the journal listed Wellhausen as a collaborator in one issue.[180]) A different, short-lived, trilingual, international review did print an original work of his, though: namely, *Cosmopolis*.[181] Concerning the national sphere of editorial or advisory boards, he also served in a consultative capacity for the series *Quellen der Religionsgeschichte*, a translation project underwritten by the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen – the German answer to Max Müller's (1823–1900) *Sacred Books of the East* – and sat, albeit unwillingly, on the committee of the German Oriental Society in conjunction with his post in Halle.[182] Certainly, Wellhausen did appreciate the collections at foreign libraries and admired those colleagues from other lands who could join him in the dizzying heights of philological eminence. But he preferred the dimmer corners of his workroom to the spotlight of an international public.

Wellhausen's achievements, on the one hand, and his overall reserve in at least the open kind of active engagement in academic politics and political academics, on the other, have supplied substantial fuel for the fire that is a narrative, which still refuses to die, of independent, great-man genius. As observed by his successor, "The recognition pleased him to be sure, but he placed no value in it."[183] Another Göttingen colleague, Hugo Willrich (1867–1950), likewise rhapsodized of Wellhausen, "The ambition to play a role in academic matters, to assert his influence in personnel issues, to convert a great public to his thought, or even to speak before such a public[– these] he knew so little as he did the inclination to concern himself practically with the politics of the day or the concerns of his

sen to Smith, August 14, 1880, in ibid., 75; Wellhausen to Socin, May 12, 1882, in ibid., 101–02; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, November 8, [1881,] in ibid., 91.

179 Wellhausen to Harnack, May 26, 1907, in ibid., 517–18.

180 Cf. Wellhausen, *Briefe*, Appendix 7: Bibliography, 837.

181 Julius Wellhausen, "Die alte arabische Poesie," *Cosmopolis* 1, no. 1 (1896): 592–604.

182 See the program of "Quellen der Religionsgeschichte," July 1, 1913, in Archiv der Göttinger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Unternehmungen der Akademie Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Herausgabe der "Quellen der Religionsgeschichte," 1913–21 (Sign. Scient 167, Vol. 1); cf. Wellhausen, *Briefe*, Appendix 7: Bibliography, 837. Though further listed under contributors and editorial revisers for the 25- (later 27-) volume series *Historians' History of the World* – an undertaking led by one Henry Smith Williams – the project consisted in no small part of translations into English from works already published; for instance, the introductory essay for the history of Israel came from Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (in volume two), whereas the history of formative Islam fell to Wellhausen, more specifically, through the rendering of his *Ein Gemeinwesen ohne Obrigkeit* (in volume eight).

183 Littmann, "Erinnerung an Julius Wellhausen," 20.

locale or to squander valuable time with vapid socializing."[184] Indeed, the orientalist neither issued a collection of speeches – rather customary for distinguished intellectuals of the time – nor did he set in his sights the University of Berlin or even aspire to ascend the ranks of university administration more broadly. He most certainly did not endeavor to project his voice into the popular arena on anything so much as resembling a regular basis.[185] It was in this respect that Rudolf Otto (1869–1937) drew a contrast – and not an unfavorable one – between Wellhausen and Humboldt:

> Julius Wellhausen was not a *homo universalis*, intent on his own cultivation or on shaping himself as a microcosm, nor did he want to be. Instead, he was a typical modern academic. He wrestled with a single, concrete area of research through hard, relentless work. He advanced methodically from specific, established points and gradually expanded the object he studied. He stayed quiet more than he spoke, and only timidly and from a distance did he relate his work to some ultimate idea.[186]

Carry weight though he might, the esteemed professor seems to have seldom thrown it around – at least not in public view. Wellhausen was hardly a Harnack, scarcely a Wilamowitz. (Of course, the belief in a disinterested and apolitical conception of scientific inquiry was not itself without implicit interests and politics, for even a stance of great remove was closely implicated in the status quo.[187]) These depictions of an exercised restraint or an instinctive modesty corresponded to other dispositions reported in obituaries. They oft portrayed a man remarkably down to earth, embodied in words like "natural" and "simple."[188] Such descriptions therefore corresponded to the preferences of Wellhausen him-

---

[184] Hugo Willrich, "Zur Erinnerung an Julius Wellhausen," *Deutsche Rundschau* 175 (1918): 407–12, at 411. On Willrich's antisemitism, see Christhard Hoffmann, *Juden und Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Studies in Judaism in Modern Times 9; Leiden: Brill, 1988), 192–93; Robert P. Ericksen, *Complicity in the Holocaust: Churches and Universities in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 74; Robert P. Ericksen, "Kontinuitäten konservativer Geschichtsschreibung am Seminar für Mittlere und Neuere Geschichte. Von der Weimarer Zeit über die nationalsozialistische Ära bis in die Bundesrepublik," in *Die Universität Göttingen unter dem Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Heinrich Becker, Hans-Joachim Dahms, and Cornelia Wegeler, 2nd ed. (Munich: Saur, 1998), 427–53, at 431–34.

[185] On Wellhausen's public engagement, most often in the form of signed petitions, cf. Paul Michael Kurtz, "The Way of War: Wellhausen, Israel, and Bellicose *Reiche*," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 127, no. 1 (2015): 1–19, at 2–7.

[186] Rudolf Otto, "The Idea of the Modern University," in idem, *Autobiographical and Social Essays,* trans. and ed. Gregory D. Alles (History of Religions in Translation 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996), 176.

[187] On the political entanglements of academicians at the time, see Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins*, esp. 119–27, 253–304; Rüdiger vom Bruch, *Wissenschaft, Politik und öffentliche Meinung. Gelehrtenpolitik im Wilhelminischen Deutschland (1890–1914)* (Historische Studien 435; Husum: Matthiesen, 1980), esp. 58–66.

[188] Cf. Willrich, "Zur Erinnerung an Julius Wellhausen," 411; Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 69–70

self, who much preferred prose to poetry and history to fantasy.[189] Indeed, the semitist may well have been a great intellect, even person, of individual mind. But as suggested by the father whose footprints he followed to Göttingen, by the forebears whose work he so powerfully expanded, or by the patrons whose influence he exploited for professional gain, Wellhausen fed upon – and nourished in return – an entire ecosystem of religious and political forces competing in the German Empire. In fact, similar forces he then sought to understand in the distant past of ancient Israel.

[189] See, e.g., Wellhausen to de Goeje, December 20, 1879, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 64–65; Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 2, 1905, in ibid., 463–65; Wellhausen to Schwartz, February 15, 1907, in ibid., 499–501.

Chapter Two

The Rise and Fall of a Hebrew Nation

Wellhausen was considered an estranged son and a traitor – already at university and to more than his mother church. He was also seen as a spy. These perceptions centered on his sentiment towards Prussia. Though a minister in Hamelin, his father had come from Hanover, stemming from a line of master tailors, ones charged with the hunting accoutrements of the royal family; his godfather and uncle (also Julius) had served the House of Guelph as well, as surgeon to the court. Bound further by his mother to the capital, where her father, Johann Friedrich Lahmeyer, had served as organist and music teacher in the Aegidienkirche, the young Julius thus defied both expectation and appeal from his own kindred when he chose to side against the Kingdom of Hanover in those troubled years of 1866 to 1871, following the Seven Weeks', or Austro-Prussian, War.[1] So resolute was his support of Prussia that Wellhausen, working as a private tutor in Hanover between 1865 and 1867, found himself a suspected intelligencer.[2] Having returned to Göttingen – also of that former kingdom, now an annexed province – to sit at the feet of Ewald as well as lecture in the *Stift*, the apprentice then suffered a rift with his master. As Schwartz recounted the story, Ewald had summoned Wellhausen, proclaimed him the lone one able to assume his scientific mantle, yet offered him his blessing only on condition that the heir apparent denounce the King of Prussia and Iron Chancellor as "criminals" and "villains."[3] Once Wellhausen refused, Ewald pushed him out the door, in tears, and the two never reconciled: some time later, during a short stay in Göttingen, the one-time

[1] Many of these details on Wellhausen's early life appear in Smend, "Julius Wellhausen," in idem, *From Astruc to Zimmerli*, 91–92; Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 45–48; cf. pp. 25–26 supra. Further information on deeper family history comes from the volumes of *Hof- und Staats-Handbuch für das Königreich Hannover* and *Staats- und Adress-Kalender für das Königreich Hannover*.

[2] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 52. Wellhausen taught the boys of consistorial council and high-bailiff (*Landdrost*) Ernst Cammann (1818–1874) (cf. Wellhausen to the Göttingen Faculty of Theology, [mid January, 1868,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 6; Wellhausen's curriculum vitae in ibid., 787–88, at 788). A leader of the Guelphic opposition, Cammann refused an oath to the Prussian king and, as a result, saw himself pensioned, in 1867 (cf. Lothar Machtan, *Mut zur Moral. Aus der privaten Korrespondenz des Gesellschaftsreformers Theodor Lohmann*, Vol. 1, *1850–1883* [Bremen: Temmen, 1995], 210 n. 2).

[3] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 52; cf. also Wellhausen, "Heinrich Ewald," 79–80. On Ewald's politics, see further Lothar Perlitt, "Heinrich Ewald: Der Gelehrte in der Politik," in *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, ed. by Bernd Moeller (Göttinger Universitätsschriften A/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 157–212.

student approached his teacher, hand extended, but the latter turned away. Of Wellhausen Schwartz reported, "The greatness of Bismarck he recognized at once and held to it unswervingly …."[4]

Wellhausen's admiration of Bismarck characterized not only his vision of politics but also his perspective on the past. "The state is no ideal but the highest power," he penned to Harnack, "which must be there to secure peace and law so that everything living can bustle."[5] With his attraction to *Realpolitik*, this ancient historian delighted in figures strong on statecraft – though perhaps more dubious on morality – a propensity that became apparent in his portrait of statesmen like David, Herod, and al-Hajjaj.[6] Indeed, this affinity filled his portrayal of the ancient world. Specialists in different disciplines, commenting on different aspects of his oeuvre, have all recognized this single quality at work. As biblical scholar Hermann Spieckermann observes, "His sympathy for the imperial founder David emanates, on the whole, from the same source as his admiration of the imperial founder Bismarck. It is an affirmation of a strong political will that attempts to create viable states (according to contemporary judgment), which have to protect order and law through their institutions."[7] So, too, Arnaldo Momigliano, the

[4] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 52. See also his own comments scattered over decades: Wellhausen to Smith, [October 1881,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 93, 95; Wellhausen to the Limprichts, May 18, 1884, in ibid., 148–50; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, December 16, 1885, in ibid., 189; Wellhausen to Smith, October 23, 1888, in ibid., 217–18; Wellhausen to Heinrich Limpricht, April 20, 1896, in ibid., 337–38; Wellhausen to Justi, March 30, 1900, in ibid., 382–83; Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 2, 1905, in ibid., 463–65.

[5] Wellhausen to Harnack, [1907,] in ibid., 519–20. The larger passage merits reproduction: "The problem of the state is difficult. It is no longer tasked with Christianity but culture. All the same: this leads to assigning it impossible tasks, to overstretching and to overestimating it. One sees this in all the cringing (*gesinnungstüchtigen*) lead articles and in all the patriotic shooters speeches (*Schützenreden*). The strength of Catholicism seems to me to consist in the protest against it. The weakness, in that it does not want to recognize the sovereignty of the state over all associations *as associations with earthly power*. I believe the Americans are on the better path than we German idealists of the state (*Staatsidealisten*). The state is no ideal but the highest power, which must be there to secure peace and law so that everything living can bustle. In relation to the culture of today, the state seems to me to have the task of braking, not accelerating [it]. The competition of the nations in trade[,] industry, and colonies must one day collapse; this scurrying, which on every level only causes further dissatisfaction, finds death by its own hand. Of course, I see that the state, through its tremendous need for money, is compelled to ally itself with the devil. However, I consider that an emergency. I look with sorrow that Westphalia is already half ruined and that Hanover is following [it]. The state is nothing momentary, like culture" (ibid., italics original); see Kurtz, "The Way of War."

[6] Cf. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 43, 62–63, 325–26; idem, "Israel," 439–40, 527–38; idem, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 254–57.

[7] Spieckermann writes further, "How little Wellhausen, tempered as conservatively as he was, elevated stately institutions in the process either spiritually or Machiavellianly emerges in his recognition of modern states' progress and loftiest duties over and against those of the ancient Near East" (Hermann Spieckermann, "Exegetischer Individualismus. Julius Wellhausen, 1844–1918," in *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, Vol. 2/2, *Kaiserreich*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Graf [Gütersloh: Mohn, 1993], 231–50, at 241); cf. also Reinhard G. Kratz, "Eyes and

great historian of historiography, channels this same spirit, which also breathed through Wellhausen's account of early Judaism: "Alas, there had obviously been no Bismarck in the Jerusalem of the fourth or the third century B. C. to teach a lesson to the Persians or to the Macedonians."[8] In the same way, modern cultural and intellectual historian Marchand has seen, "for Wellhausen, Muhammed's chief achievement was his statecraft, his Bismarck-like unification of the Arabs."[9] Yet this motive of historiography did not prove peculiar to him. Wellhausen, like Nöldeke, who had also parted ways with teacher Ewald over Prussian sympathies, belonged to a new generation of Bismarckian liberals, ones who supported unification, championed national interests, and endorsed imperialist undertakings – albeit mostly with restraint – and who thrived in the context of a unified German Empire and especially that of Prussia, with its cultural and educational institutions characterized by tradition, hierarchy, and bureaucracy.[10] Alongside those long established bonds of heritage in *Bildungsbürgertum*, of family by marriage or blood, and of circles social and professional alike, other centrifugal forces grew in strength and increasingly consolidated this cohort, which included patronage by a monopolizing state apparatus and, often, a political sensibility oriented towards the broadly liberal. These scholars owed much of their own establishment to their promotion of the political one – or at least no open opposition to it.

The philologist may have numbered among a generation of liberal historicists in the age of unification, but he also continued an even older historiographical tradition with his interest in the nation. If Wellhausen brought the law into action as a fulcrum for his critical analysis of the Hebrew Bible (i. e., textual history) – and thereby his understanding of ancient Israel's past – that same law, to switch metaphors, also provided a major storyline for his history of the nation. This history of a Hebrew people encompassed the actualization of a nation's special character, the formation of its self-awareness, the foundation of its institutions, and the creation of a state – a narrative in which law came to play a pivotal, if questionable, role. Wellhausen's was the story that historians simply told. As Ronald Clements remarks,

---

Spectacles: Wellhausen's Method of Higher Criticism," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 60, no. 2 (2009): 381–402, at 391 [German Original (GO): "Augen und Brille: Wellhausens Methode der Höheren Kritik," in idem, *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 3, *Mythos und Geschichte* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 102; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 87–103].

[8] Momigliano, "Religious History Without Frontiers," 52.

[9] Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 188. Of the essence, she observes, more broadly, how "Wellhausen's work championed the liberal ideals of his era: individual liberty, freedom of conscience, and the virtues of national, political autonomy" (ibid., 184).

[10] Cf. esp ibid., 97, 158–59, 178, 210–11. Nöldeke's father, Carl (1800–1866), was a university friend of Ewald's: see Hartmut Bobzin, "Theodor Nöldekes Biographische Blätter aus dem Jahr 1917," in *"Sprich doch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch, wir verstehen es!": 60 Beiträge zur Semitistik, Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Werner Arnold and Hartmut Bobzin (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), 91–104, at 92.

The model of a national history of ancient Israel was largely based upon comparable efforts in a similar direction for the classical empires of Greece and Rome. It would, in retrospect, be hard to overestimate the extent to which researches into the history of ancient Israel were influenced by comparable researches into the history of ancient Greece and Rome during the nineteenth century.[11]

This model – the fate of an antique nation – supplied a framework for Wellhausen's other ventures, too. Small wonder the Oxford fellow in classics J. G. C. Anderson (1870–1952) included the German philologist's account of early Islam in the edition he produced, for The Student's Series, of Edward Gibbon's (1737–1794) *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.[12]

This chapter locates Wellhausen's specific work on ancient Israel within his larger historiographic corpus. Against this background of the German Empire's own national history and the predilections of a generation that came of age at the time of unification, it examines his proclivity for the history of nations, with a special interest in consolidation and in statecraft. First, the inquiry briefly surveys the fields in which he labored. As Wellhausen moved universities (from Göttingen through Greifswald, Halle, and Marburg back to Göttingen), faculties (to philosophy from theology), and positions (full professor, private docent then associate professor, and a full one once again), he changed both principal primary languages (Hebrew, Arabic, Greek) and periods of study (ancient Israel, forma-

[11] Ronald E. Clements, "Israel in its historical and cultural setting," in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives. Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study*, ed. R. E. Clements (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 3–16, at 3–4. Clements extends the argument: "This, however, is simply to point out how extensively a particular kind of scholarly undertaking acquired methods, aims and credentials of a distinctive kind which became internationally regarded as standard …. The requirements of *Altertumswissenschaft* – the science of the study of antiquity – took on a self-authenticating momentum, irrespective of the extent to which such a scientific task could be regarded as providing the best way of communicating a sense of the riches of these ancient civilisations to the modern world" (ibid.). So, too, Jack Sasson's has observed, in an all too overlooked essay: "The great achievement of Bismarckian diplomacy as it took advantage of potential crises and turned a paralysed Frankfurt Confederacy (*Bund*) into an Empire held center stage. German scholars launched extensive searches for the historical roots of nation-states, they devoted many pages to the personality and achievements of diplomatic and martial figures, and they pondered philosophical questions regarding the dominance of ethical laws in history. Although at its greatest moments of influence, about the turn of the century, this historiographic movement was abusing its potential and was serving chauvinistic goals, it nevertheless did create a heritage of scholarship in which the nation-state, because it was regarded as the highest manifestation of any single culture, received the largest share of historiographical attention" (idem, "On Choosing Models for Recreating Israelite Pre-Monarchic History," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 21 [1981]: 3–24, at 9).

[12] J. G. C. Anderson, *The Student's Gibbon: A History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Abridged from the Original Work by Sir William Smith D. C. L., LL.D.*, Vol. 2, *From A. D. 565 to the Capture of Constantinople by the Turks*, rev. ed. (London: Murray, 1901). Wellhausen himself had referred to Gibbon in his work (idem, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Falls*, 342; idem, "Israel," 544–45) as well as private correspondence (Wellhausen to Schwartz, December 1, 1909, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 548).

tive Islam, and early Christianity). These transitions notwithstanding, the fundamental issues of what Wellhausen wanted to know, how he sought to know it, and why he judged the past the way he did remained consistent all the while. His work on the Hebrew Bible displayed the intellectual course he would continue to travel. Next, this chapter examines the making of Wellhausen's most famous, and most controversial, book in his first field of research: commonly known as *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. If so many of the problems he perceived, the solutions he suggested, and the conclusions he drew across his fields of study emerged already at the start of his career – in this specific area of inquiry – the story of ancient Israel he told altered little over the venues, editions, and decades. Wellhausen's early sketch of that history thus provided the basic outline for his subsequent portrayals, no matter how fuller or deeper they appeared. Thirdly, the inquiry turns, in brief, to the type of history he wrote. Wellhausen traced the rise and fall of a Hebrew nation: from the formation of its self-awareness through its political organization to its ultimate demise. This national history then justified, in part, his distinction between ancient Israel and Judaism. Fourth, this chapter explores how Wellhausen conceptualized the relationship of religion and politics in the life of that nation and beyond. With his understanding of religion, state, and nation, Wellhausen theorized the nature not only of the church but also of theocracy in historical perspective. Such reasoning further entered Wellhausen's second field of study. His analysis proceeded from the genealogy or historical connection of Israel, Judaism, and Christianity to a comparable development – or entanglement of nation, religion, and politics – that he saw in formative Islam. Finally, the chapter concludes with an overlooked dimension of his oeuvre: primitive Semitic society. Wellhausen disassembled textual traditions to reach the earliest layers and sought to leverage those earliest layers to arrive at an earlier time, at times beyond literary society. However, his conceptual system allowed him to transcend data sets and traditions. On principles of primitivity and semiticity, he could move between Arabs and Israelites. Rather than prolegomena, however, these principles mostly went unsaid.

2.1 Old Testament as Prologue

The subtitle of a small book by doyen of things Wellhausen, Rudolf Smend (Jr.), hails him *ein Bahnbrecher in drei Disziplinen*.[13] Notably, these topical endeavors

[13] Rudolf Smend, *Julius Wellhausen. Ein Bahnbrecher in drei Disziplinen* (Munich: Carl Friedrich von Siemens Stiftung, 2006). The best survey of Wellhausen's work in its entirety remains Otto Eißfeldt, "Julius Wellhausen," *Internationale Monatschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 14 (1920): 193–208, 325–38 [repr. in idem, *Kleine Schriften,* 6 vols., ed. Rudolf Sellheim and Fritz Maass (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1962–79), 1:56–71], cited according to the reprint; see also Knight, ed., *Julius Wellhausen and his* Prolegomena to the History of Israel.

corresponded to distinguishable phases in his career. As tutor and instructor at Göttingen (1868–1872) and full professor of Old Testament at Greifswald (1872–1882), Wellhausen focused on the Hebrew Bible: its language, its composition, its transmission, and the ancient past they all suggested. In the second phase, he concentrated on Arabic sources and the history of Islam, which he undertook as private docent for and then associate professor of Semitic languages at Halle (1882–1885), full professor of Semitic philology and oriental history at Marburg (1885–1892), and finally chair for oriental languages at Göttingen (1892–1902 or so). In the third and final period of Wellhausen's career, still at Göttingen (ca. 1902–1914), he devoted his efforts to research on the New Testament, including early Christianity.[14] Of course, an overemphasis on faculties and fields, on disciplines and posts, can obscure the still greater erudition he displayed. While the volumes Wellhausen reviewed came in any number of languages, the sheer range of their contents was staggering indeed: beyond the expected textual studies and ancient history through medieval trade and catalography to epigraphy, geography, and linguistics.[15] Nonetheless, as Peter Machinist has observed, "the fact is that the changes in Wellhausen's scholarly career were decisive ones, comprising real shifts in what were the objects of his primary, his most intensive and creative, research."[16] These shifts and changes notwithstanding, Wellhausen held fast to the ends and means of his scholarship. The motives and measures of his historiography remained mostly constant in the process, as detailed in chapter three. However, this supposed pathfinder of disciplines has earned uneven estimates of what he found, exactly, and how, precisely, he found it. If the philologist doubtless worked the soil of three separate fields of study, there is still some room for doubt as to whether he himself broke ground in all of them, or at least to what extent.

Wellhausen secured early accolades in his first orbit of academia. According to the Netherlander Kuenen, already at the age of 34 the young professor had marked a new one in Old Testament research with his efforts on the Hexateuch (*eene époque-makende bijdrage*).[17] The distinguished English scholar Samuel Rolles Driver

[14] The description of his various positions varies across the literature: apart from the more general designation as professor of theology vs. professor of philosophy, some sources alternate the adjectives between oriental and Semitic and combine the different nouns of languages, philology, literature, and history for the chairs he held at Halle, Marburg, and Göttingen: cf., e. g., Wilhelm Ebel, *Catalogus Professorum Gottingensium, 1734–1962* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 45, 112; Gundlach, *Catalogus Professorum Academiae Marburgensis*, Vol. 1, *Von 1527 bis 1910*, 425–26; and the online *Catalogus professorum Halensis*, not to mention his sundry biographical portraits and necrologies.

[15] Cf. the bibliography provided in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 818–37.

[16] Machinist, "The Road Not Taken," 473.

[17] See Abraham Kuenen, review of *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, by Friedrich Bleek, edited by Julius Wellhausen, *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 12 (1878): 370–75, at 373; cf. idem, review of *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, by Julius Wellhausen (under the heading "Geschiedenis van Israël en van den Israëlietischen godsdienst"), *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 13 (1879): 140–54; see further Smend, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," 443–45; idem, "Kuenen und

(1846–1914) likewise deemed Wellhausen's book on textual criticism "an unpretending but epoch-making work" and applauded his "rare acumen and sagacity."[18] Closer to home, Stade commended the first volume of *Geschichte Israels* for consolidating a generation and a half of biblical criticism and giving an auspicious literary form to the analytical trajectory of Leopold George (1811–1873), Wilhelm Vatke (1806–1882), Eduard Reuß (1804–1891), Karl Heinrich Graf (1815–1869), August Kayser (1821–1885), as well as Kuenen.[19] In fact, already his licentiate dissertation had received positive reviews.[20] Without a doubt, Wellhausen continues even today to tower in his first field of research. The now classic disciplinary history by John Rogerson recounts – to follow the book's section titles – "the Path to Wellhausen" and finds its dénouement in "the Triumph of Wellhausen."[21] Relating this dominant narrative, yet another critic writes, "It is impossible to describe the effect of this great work. […] The decade following the publication of the *Prolegomena* saw the capitulation of almost every influential Old Testament scholar in

Wellhausen," in *Abraham Kuenen (1828–1891): His Major Contributions to the Study of the Old Testament. A Collection of Studies Published on the Occasion of the Centenary of Abraham Kuenen's Death (10 December 1991)*, ed. P. B. Dirksen & A. van der Kooij (Oudtestamentische Studiën 29; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 113–27.

[18] Samuel Rolles Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890), iii, iv, in which he discussed Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871).

[19] Bernhard Stade, review of *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, by Julius Wellhausen, *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 26 (June 28, 1879): 825–28. Though giving credit where credit was due, Rudolf Kittel (1853–1929) felt the need to set the record straight still some decades later: "The Grafian theory did not become popular, however, until it was adopted by *Wellhausen* (1878), by whose name it was afterwards – wrongly – called, whilst the real authors were Edward Reuss of Strassburg, Vatke and George" (Kittel, *The Scientific Study of the Old Testament: Its Principal Results, and their Bearing upon Religious Instruction*, trans. J. Caleb Hughes [London: Williams & Norgate, 1910], 74, italics original) [GO: *Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft in ihren wichtigsten Ergebnissen, mit Berücksichtigung des Religionsunterrichts*, 1st ed. (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1910)]. On this point, cf. also William A. Irwin, "The Significance of Julius Wellhausen," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 12, no. 3 (1944): 160–73, where the author asserts, "We must not belittle his achievement; he it was who possessed the insight to recognize the logical meaning of the direction that critical thought and achievements of the time had taken, and the ability to present this conclusion with inescapable logic. And the same qualities of clear thinking and objectivity in the use of evidence carried him on through his entire career of criticism of, first, the Old Testament, then, the New. Yet equally it is important to realize fully that his greatness and significance are as the voice of an age, as the climax of a long and widely diffused activity. In a sense he is the symbol of nineteenth century Biblical criticism" (165).

[20] Cf. Ferdinand Hitzig, review of *De gentibus et familiis judaeis quae 1 Chr. 2.4 enumerantur*, by Julius Wellhausen, *De aetate carminum Dt. XXXII et XXXIII et quae inde sequantur ad circumscribendam Deuteronomii aetatem*, by Joannes Lehmann, and *De summa carminis Jobi sententia disputavit*, by Guilelmus Volck, *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur* 63, no. 56 (1870): 881–87; Theodor Nöldeke, review of *De gentibus et familiis judaeis quae 1 Chr. 2.4 enumerantur,* by Julius Wellhausen, *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 21, no. 43 (1870): 1155–56. Both reviewers expressed their hope to encounter the young theologian in the future.

[21] Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century.*

Germany to the new teaching …."[22] For defenders and detractors – and almost everyone in between – the name Wellhausen often signifies a general approach, specific theories, or an entire era of scholarship for research on the Hebrew Bible. If his most creative ventures in the field hardly lasted a decennium, even a centennium onwards his impact casts a long shadow (or, to others, provides a light) – the work and worker alike having reached near fabled proportions.

As for Arabic and Islam, his effect was rather belated. Wellhausen himself expressed dismay at the sluggish reception of his labors; even so, he earned equal fame in the end.[23] Becker deemed his industry here – probably quite rightly – in fact even more innovative than those in the Old Testament, acclaiming *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz* "a kind of Bible" for historians of early Islam.[24] In a review of *Reste arabischen Heidentumes*, the venerable semitist Nöldeke, too, extolled, "[Wellhausen] has immersed himself in the thought and activities (*Treiben*) of the old Arabs as though he had always only been an arabist."[25] Assessing the second edition, the Durkheimian Marcel Mauss (1872–1950) likewise commended its "strictly historical method," which gave the work an even greater value than that of Scotsman Smith's foundational *Religion of the Semites*.[26] As testaments to his productivity in this field, other such endeavors included *Muhammed in Medina*, *Der arabische Josippus, Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam*, and especially the fourth volume of *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, which contained *Medina vor dem Islam*, *Muhammads Gemeindeordnung von Medina*, and *Seine Schreiben, und die Gesandtschaften an ihn*.[27] Wellhausen set major

[22] R. J. Thompson, *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 19; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 58, 60.

[23] An excellent survey of Wellhausen's work on Islam comes from Rudolph's "Wellhausen as an Arabist."

[24] Becker, "Julius Wellhausen," 95–99; cf. Eißfeldt, "Julius Wellhausen"; but see Stephen J. Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet: The End of Muhammad's Life and the Beginnings of Islam* (Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 124–26; idem, "Muḥammad and the Qur'ān," in *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity,* ed. Scott F. Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1078–1108, at 1086–87.

[25] Theodor Nöldeke, review of *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. Drittes Heft. Reste arabischen Heidenthumes* (*sic*), by Julius Wellhausen, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 41 (1887): 707–26, at 707. The orthography of this first edition read *Reste arabischen Heidentums* (1887), in contrast to the second edition's *Reste arabischen Heidentums*; unless otherwise noted, citation comes from the 2nd edition (Berlin: Reimer, 1897). On the difference between these editions, see Rogerson, "Wellhausen and Robertson Smith as Sociologists of early Arabia and ancient Israel," *Journal of Scottish Thought* 1, no. 2 (2008): 53–61, at 55–58; cf. also Wellhausen to Justi, May 16, 1894, in idem, *Briefe*, 338–39.

[26] Marcel Mauss, review of *Reste des Arabischen Heidentums* (*sic*) *(Vestiges du paganisme en Arabie*), 2nd ed., by Julius Wellhausen, *L'Année sociologique* 1 (1896–1897): 183–86, at 183. The edition of Wellhausen's letters mistakenly attributes this review to Henri Hubert (Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 829).

[27] Julius Wellhausen, *Muhammed in Medina. Das ist Vakidi's Kitab alMaghazi in verkürzter deutscher Wiedergabe* (Berlin: Reimer, 1882); idem, *Der arabische Josippus* (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse n.s.

trends in scholarship – ones that lasted decades, be it by source evaluation or his reconstructed narratives; as a result, the disparagement of Sayf Ibn ʻUmar and the notions of distinct Arabian, Iraqi, and Syrian "historical schools" deeply impressed subsequent endeavors.[28] His efforts continue to enjoy acclaim today. While Chase Robinson judges, "Wellhausen's *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz* has still not been surpassed, for all that it represents a nineteenth-century Orientalist re-casting of ninth-century historiography," Ira Lapidus christens it "the classic history of the Umayyad period," an evaluation similar to that of Gerald Hawting.[29] The semitist's labors here may not have reached the status of legend, but they have proven at least as influential as those in Hebrew Bible – likely more significant in terms of innovation.

His legacy differs, however, in the third realm of research. True, Adolf Jülicher (1857–1938), formidable scholar of New Testament and early Christianity and personal friend to Wellhausen, ended one review with "an expression of grateful admiration for the abundance of treasures that the treasure seeker by profession finds in it [sc. the work], for the allure that it must unfailingly exert upon whoever happens to come along."[30] He ended another with a paean to this "master of historical criticism":

> Sound knowledge, unbiased judgment, subtle understanding of and empathy to even the most foreign materials[, and] uncompromising love of truth unite in him with a creative power that always seems to grow with the difficulty of its task: some chapters in the *Introduction* could only be compared with the most radiant masterpieces in historiographic literature.[31]

1/4; Berlin: Weidmann, 1897); idem, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam* (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse n.s. 5/2; Berlin: Weidmann, 1901); idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 4, *Medina vor dem Islam, Muhammads Gemeindeordnung von Medina*, *Seine Schreiben, und die Gesandtschaften an ihn* (Berlin: Reimer, 1889).

[28] See Fred M. Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writing* (Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 14; Princeton: Darwin Press, 1998), 5–25, 215–16; Ella Landau-Tasseron, "Sayf Ibn ʻUmar in Medieval and Modern Scholarship," *Der Islam* 67, no. 1 (1990): 1–26; cf. also Gregor Schoeler, "Die Frage der schriftlichen oder mündlichen Überlieferung der Wissenschaften im frühen Islam," *Der Islam* 62, no. 2 (1985): 201–30, at 216 n. 72; see further Gerard R. Hawting, *The Idea of Idolatry and the Emergence of Islam: From Polemic to History* (Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), esp. 26–28.

[29] Chase F. Robinson, "Islamic Historical Writing, Eighth through the Tenth Centuries," in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, Vol. 2, *400–1400*, ed. idem and Sarah Foot, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 238–66, at 242; Ira M. Lapidus, *Islamic Societies to the Nineteenth Century: A Global History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 704; Gerald R. Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam: The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661–750,* 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2000), xxi–xxii.

[30] Adolf Jülicher, review of *Das Evangelium Marci*, by Julius Wellhausen, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 29, no. 9 (1904): 256–61, at 261.

[31] Adolf Jülicher, review of *Das Evangelium Matthaei*, *Das Evangelium Lucae*, and *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, by Julius Wellhausen, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 30, no. 23

Discussing his work on the gospel of John, the American germanophile Caspar René Gregory (1846–1917) wrote, in German, New Testament colleagues could consider themselves blessed simply for having such an established scholar active in their field.[32] Now, Wellhausen saw much that would occupy future inquiry. As Hans Dieter Betz remarks, "Wellhausen's Jesus was not a Christian but a Jew, while Harnack's Jesus more and more looked like a liberal Protestant like Harnack himself. This exchange between Wellhausen and Harnack determined the main options as they are discussed up to the present time in New Testament scholarship."[33] Roland Deines, too, considers his early work on the Pharisees to be the one nineteenth-century monograph on the subject not to have lost its significance – even if this volume, concerned as it is with religious politics of the past, has perhaps attracted less attention than his more standard exegesis of biblical texts.[34] But for all his celebrated insight, Wellhausen suffered considerable censure as well. Assenters and even admirers have deemed his commentaries unsustained at best and scattershot at worst. They have also faulted his inattention to other scholars, a critique leveled at him in other spheres as well.[35] However unsurprisingly, his axing of biblical material assignable to Jesus himself did not

(1905): 615–21, at 615 [page 616 is mistakenly printed as 661]. To Jülicher and Schwartz Wellhausen dedicated his *Erweiterungen und Änderungen im vierten Evangelium* (Berlin: Reimer, 1907).

[32] Caspar René Gregory, *Wellhausen und Johannes* (Versuche und Entwürfe 3; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910), 1.

[33] See Hans Dieter Betz, "The Sermon on the Mount and Q: Some Aspects of the Problem," repr. in idem, *Synoptische Studien* (Gesammelte Aufsätze 2; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 249–69, at 261; cf. idem, "Wellhausen's Dictum 'Jesus was not a Christian, but a Jew' in Light of Present Scholarship," in idem, *Antike und Christentum* (Gesammelte Aufsätze 4; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1998), 1–31; idem, "Neues Testament und griechisch-hellenistische Überlieferung," repr. in idem, *Hellenismus und Urchristentum* (Gesammelte Aufsätze 1; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1990), 262–69; cf. also idem, *Der Apostel Paulus in Rom* (Julius-Wellhausen-Vorlesung 4; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 1–4; see further Allen Wikgren, "Wellhausen on the Synoptic Gospels: A Centenary Appraisal," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 12, no. 3 (1944): 174–80.

[34] Roland Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 40.

[35] See, e. g., Johannes Weiss, "Wellhausens Evangelienkommentar," *Theologische Rundschau* 8, no. 1 (1906): 1–9 at 1, 9; Alfred Loisy, review of *Das Evangelium Marci* and *Das Evangelium Matthaei,* by Julius Wellhausen, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 25, no. 49 (1904): 382–88, at 382; but cf. idem, review of *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* and *Das Evangelium Lucae*, by Julius Wellhausen, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 27, no. 54 (1906): 441–52; see also Jülicher, review of *Das Evangelium Marci*, by Wellhausen; idem, review of *Das Evangelium Matthaei*, *Das Evangelium Lucae*, and *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, by Wellhausen; Erwin Preuschen, review of *Das Evangelium Marci* and *Das Evangelium Matthaei*, by Julius Wellhausen, *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 25, no. 26 (1905): 821–86. For a study of Wellhausen's use of footnotes, see Henning Trüper, "Wie es uneigentlich gewesen. Zum Gebrauch der Fußnote bei Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918)," *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, n.s. 23, no. 2 (2013): 329–42. On the place of Wellhausen's work on the New Testament in the context of earlier scholarship, see Adolf Hilgenfeld, "J. Wellhausen und die synoptischen Evangelien," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 49 (1906): 193–238.

go uncontested either, not least among those on the more conservative end of the spectrum. In an essay commemorating Wellhausen's New Testament research, Nils Dahl confirms such endeavors "were as controversial as his *Prolegomena* [*to the History of Israel*] but never gained the same importance."[36] Rather, his significance lay in application. Like medical man Jean Astruc (1684–1766) a century and a half before him – whom Goethe had praised for "first [applying] knife and probe to the Pentateuch"[37] – Wellhausen put the knife of criticism to that sacred cow of New Testament texts. Nonetheless, the days of Baur and David Friedrich Strauß (1808–1874), two earlier and still more controversial iconoclasts, were already long past. If Wellhausen blazed any trails in the field, he did so with a trusty map, well-worn tools, and experience aplenty.

Throughout his reconstructions of the past, common themes consistently emerged. No matter the time, the place, the language, the source, the tradition, or the people, historiography by Wellhausen tended to feature certain elements. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all had watershed moments. While the deportation and restoration severed Judaism from Israel, the messianic crucifixion divided Christianity from Judaism, and Muhammed in Medina separated Islam from "Arabian heathendom." Furthermore, these three religions suffered from the same historical ailment: manipulative epigoni. If a propagation of the Mosaic law established Judaism, a proclamation of the apostolic gospel founded Christianity, and a promulgation of the Sunna and Quran solidified Islam. With characteristic acumen, Marchand encapsulates this narrative: "world-historical religions were merely the products of sly and self-serving, if also genuinely pious, acolytes; just as the second temple Jews created Judaism, the apostles created Christianity, and Muhammed's disciples invented Islam."[38] The precise sequencing may have differed depending among them, yet an intrusive, formalized theocracy gripped each one of these traditions.

In all of them, moreover, prior outshone post. As Friedemann (Uri) Boschwitz uncovered long ago, originality in the sense of naturalness drove the historiography of Wellhausen.[39] Such sentiment seeped into the estimation of language.

---

[36] Nils A. Dahl, "Wellhausen on the New Testament," in *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, ed. Knight, 89–110, at 104; cf. also Martin Hengel, "Julius Wellhausens Evangelienkommentare," repr. in idem, *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 7, *Theologische, historische und biographische Skizzen*, ed. Claus-Jürgen Thornton (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 253; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 492–98; William Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, Vol. 2, *From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 151–56.

[37] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, "Schicksal der Handschrift," repr. in idem, *Werke*, Hamburger Ausgabe, 13th ed., ed. Erich Trunz, 14 vols. (Munich: Beck, 2002), 13:102–05.

[38] Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 183–84.

[39] Cf. his perspicacious statement, for example, "Originality (*Ursprünglichkeit*) – that is the concept of truth grasped historically. What Wellhausen already said about the philological enterprise of establishing the original text – : ' … but conjecture does not seek to arrive at this or that intermediate stage of the development (which has led from the archetype to the recension lying

Whether the Quran's "completely un-Arabic Arabic" compared to early Hudhail poetry, Chronicles' "frequently unintelligible" Hebrew vis-à-vis that of Samuel and Kings, or John's "impression of pedantry as in the Priestly Codex" (in contrast to Mark's colloquialism and Luke's erudition), writing – as language and literature alike – declined with the passage of time.[40] These evaluations, of course, corresponded to similar periodization in especially classical scholarship, which

---

before us) but at the beginning, for only the truth bears witness to itself' (*[Bücher] Sam[uelis]* 7.), this applies from the historical enterprise indeed to his life work in its entirety and its essence: it is directed towards that truth which bears witness to itself of the general human 'originality' and authenticity precisely of those times and peoples whom he has chosen for himself as the subject matter": Friedemann (Uri) Boschwitz, *Julius Wellhausen. Motive und Maßstäbe seiner Geschichtsschreibung* (Berlin: Franz Linke, 1938), 14 [repr. as *Julius Wellhausen. Motive und Maß-Stäbe seiner Geschichtsschreibung* (Libelli 238; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968); this 1934 Marburg dissertation by Boschwitz went into Hebrew translation as well: *Yulyus Ṿelha'uzen: yesodot u-ḳene midah ba-hisṭoryografyah shelo*, trans. Theodore Hatalgui (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1982)]. Citation refers to the 1968 reproduction of the dissertation.

[40] Julius Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 1.2, *Lieder der Hudhailiten, Arabisch und Deutsch* (Berlin: Reimer, 1884), 105; idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 210, cf. 11, 49, 271 n. 1, 380–91; idem, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: Reimer, 1908), 145–46, respectively. As for other linguistic classifications, Wilamowitz apparently adopted the term "Jewish Greek" (*Judengriechisch*) from Wellhausen: so William M. Calder, III, and Alexander Košenina, "Ein Heide im Gespräch mit einem Christen: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs Briefwechsel mit Adolf Jülicher," repr. in *Further Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff*, ed. William M. Calder, III, prepared by Stephen Trzaskoma (Hildesheim: Weidmann, 1994), 59–73, at 65 n. 32; see Friedrich Bleek, *Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, Vol. 1, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., ed. Julius Wellhausen (Berlin: Reimer, 1878), 578, 631; Julius Wellhausen, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur," in idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.2, *Verschiedenes*, 215–49, at 234–35; idem, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 133–34; Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1st ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1905), 34, although he removed this statement from the second edition. Vatke may have also employed this phraseology, although its attestation came in lectures published posthumously: Wilhelm Vatke, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Nach Vorlesungen*, ed. Hermann G. S. Preiss, with a foreword by Adolf Hilgenfeld (Bonn: Strauss, 1886), 66. In circulation already a decennium before Wellhausen's work (cf., e. g., Theodor Zahn, *Der Hirt des Hermas* [Gotha: Perthes, 1868], 77, 491), the phrase "Jewish Greek" became a matter of greater debate in the first decades of the twentieth century: so, e. g., Torrey, "The Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels," in *Studies in the History of Religions: Presented to Crawford Howell Toy by Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends*, ed. David Gordon Lyon and George Foot Moore (New York: Macmillan, 1912), 269–317, at 287 [repr. as *The Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels* (New York: Macmillan, 1912)]; Adolf Deißmann, "Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für die Pädagogik*, Part 1, 11, no. 3 (1903): 161–77, at 162–64; Eberhard Nestle, review of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar, Vol. 1, *Prolegomena*, by James Hope Moulton, *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 26, no. 49 (1906): 1540–44; Martin Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1912): 81–116, at 87–88, 101; cf. also, earlier, Eduard König, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament, mit Einschluss der Apokryphen und der Pseudepigraphen Alten Testaments* (Bonn: Weber [Flittner], 1893), 104, 117, 477, included in the index. On this matter, see further Torrey, "Julius Wellhausen's Approach to the Aramaic Gospels," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 101 (1951): 125–37.

often employed the categories of golden and silver ages. (Alas, no prophet had come to restore a former purity to these languages.) Additionally, the onetime professor of Protestant theology compared later periods with Catholicism, unflatteringly so. In this way, he referred to "Caesareopapy" among the Abbasid caliphate, parturition of "the old Catholic church" by the "Mosaic theocracy" (i. e., Judaism), and incongruity of Mark's gospel with the Church of Rome.[41] The cephalopod limbs of those growing, powerful institutions eventually, perhaps inevitably, choked the life of an earlier, more natural age.

Being the vigilant reader he was, Wellhausen did present his multiplex materials with subtlety and sophistication, as more specialist surveys of his work delineate in detail. Yet the contours of his corpus, when considered as a whole, betray remarkable consistency in the overarching narratives he told, the value judgments he pronounced, and the bias he betrayed. If Wellhausen moved on to greener pastures after only about a decade in the field of Hebrew Bible, the philological beast could not change his spots. So, too, his story of ancient Israel mostly stayed the same, no matter how revised, republished, or retrofitted.

2.2 Prolegomena to a *Prolegomena*

When Wellhausen published what would become his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, in 1878, he certainly made a splash, if not a tidal wave. The controversy rippled into the anglophone world as well. To assess a book by Driver on the Old Testament, the Oxonion D. D. h.c. and Bishop Suffragan of Colchester Alfred Blomfield (1833–1894) examined the work of his Continental colleagues with especial attention to said history of Israel, although he found it "a repulsive as well as a tedious task, for one characteristic of Wellhausen is his shameless irreverence." Blomfield also averred, "… it would be impossible for any Christian writer to say worse things of the Korân than Wellhausen has said of the Old Testament."[42] For condemnation or commendation (usually the former), the historian

[41] Julius Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, trans. Margaret Graham Weir (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1927), 564 [GO: *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz* (Berlin: Reimer, 1902)]; idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 422; idem, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien,* 1st ed., 87, although he removed a statement about schismatics eschewing this gospel in favor of later ones for the work's second edition (Berlin: Reimer, 1911), 78, cf. § 19.3. Given the context of Catholics and schismatics, Wellhausen's description of Mark as "the oldest evangelical writer" (*der älteste evangelische Schriftsteller*) may not have been unknowingly ambiguous.

[42] Alfred Blomfield, *The Old Testament and the New Criticism*, cheaper ed. (London: Paternoster Row, 1895), 23, 31. Blomfield further asserted, with reference to the English translation, "To anyone who does not allow himself to lose his head, or be carried off his feet, by the display of learning and labour which Wellhausen exhibits, by his audacious ingenuity and conjectural daring, the book will, I think – in spite of the laudatory preface by Prof. Robertson Smith – appear on the whole a worthless and unprofitable one, from which serious students of the Bible can derive little, if any, enlightenment or instruction. As we read it, it positively takes our breath

of three religions found his own name featured not only in the more frequent and expected articles and reviews of various academic spheres and social sectors but also in the very titles of special prints, pamphlets, and monographs – a trend that began with his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* and continued onward with other works.[43] The controversy was real, though its size may be imagined. As Marchand has determined, "The polemics engendered by the *Prolegomena* were small scale in contrast to those of the fin de siècle, but even so, they ensured the book a wide reception."[44] Indeed, the reception endures today. Many a history of scholarship or *status quaestionis* has outlined the assemblage of arguments advanced within this work – arguments that often rested on earlier studies of his and a work that underlay his own later accounts – as well as their relationship to longer trends in biblical research. Overlooked as they may be, these contemporaneous discussions, from the long nineteenth century, still remain insightful, in some cases maybe even unsurpassed.[45] Such materials, on the one hand, and the

---

away by the audacity with which an imposing fabric is reared on the slenderest foundations, or on none at all; and we are inclined to ask ourselves whether the writer can expect to be taken seriously – whether the whole thing may not be an elaborate jest?" (ibid., 28). Twenty years onward, another Anglican clergyman and academic, George Albert Cooke (1865–1939), noted the same aversion for some: "It is a brilliant piece of constructive work, full of vivacity and human interest, and remarkable for its sureness of touch and for the directness with which it goes straight to the point; here and there, we must admit, it strikes English readers as wanting in reverence" (G. A. Cooke, "Driver and Wellhausen," *Harvard Theological Review*, 9, no. 3 [1916]: 249–57, at 255).

[43] Cf. Friedrich Roos, *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Pentateuchs, insbesondere seiner Gesetzgebung. Eine Prüfung der Wellhausen'schen Hypothese* (Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1883); Otto Naumann, *Wellhausen's Methode, kritisch beleuchtet* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886); Rudolf Finsler, *Darstellung und Kritik der Ansicht Wellhausens von Geschichte und Religion des Alten Testamentes* (Zurich: Schulthess, 1887); K. J. Volk, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion nach der Graf-Wellhausen'schen Hypothese. Vortrag auf der Jahresversammlung des Wissenschaftlichen Predigervereins am 1. Juli 1890 gehalten* (Karlsruhe: Reiff, 1891); G. Schumann, *Die Wellhausen'sche Pentateuchtheorie in ihren Grundzügen dargestellt und auf ihre Haltbarkeit geprüft* (Karlsruhe: Reiff, 1892); William Lang Baxter, *Sanctuary and Sacrifice: A Reply to Wellhausen* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895); Adolph Zahn, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. Beurteilung der Schrift von J. Wellhausen 1894* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1895); David MacDill, *The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch: Defended against the Views and Arguments of Voltaire, Paine, Colenso, Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen* (Dayton: Schuey, 1896); Johannes Meinhold, *Wellhausen* (Hefte zur "Christlichen Welt" 27; Leipzig: Mohr [Siebeck], 1897); Wilhelm Möller, *Historisch-kritische Bedenken gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese von einem früheren Anhänger, den Studierenden der Theologie gewidmet*, with a foreword by Conrad von Orelli (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1899) [ET: *Are the Critics Right? Historical & Critical Considerations against the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis*, with an introduction by Carl von Orelli, trans. Clarke Huston Irwin (New York: Revell, 1903)]; Gustav Jahn, *Beiträge zur Beurtheilung der Septuaginta. Eine Würdigung Wellhausenscher Textkritik, mit einem Anhang "Antwort auf Pretorius' Allerneustes über meine Erklärung des Sibawaihi"* (Kirchhain N-L: Schmersow, [1902]); cf. p. 142 n. 78.

[44] Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 183.

[45] For an overview of this volume in particular, see, e. g., Henry Preserved Smith, "The Critical Theories of Julius Wellhausen," *The Presbyterian Review* 3, no. 10 (1882): 357–88. For larger surveys of biblical criticism, see those of Kuenen and Kittel (cf. pp. 71 n. 19, 178 n. 31)

scope of this chapter, on the other, which focuses on the work within his larger corpus, make any such repetition here superfluous. Before turning to thematic convergences throughout his oeuvre, however, the inquiry must first address not the product but the production of an historiographic template, for ancient Israel as for other peoples.

The substructure to Wellhausen's historiography of Israel appeared between 1876 and 1878. As early as 1874, he had imparted to Kuenen his intention to write a book entitled "The Law and the Prophets" (*das Gesetz und die Propheten*), where he would "jump on the old bandwagon – one cannot say the truth often enough – " and which he would dedicate to none other than Wilhelm Vatke.[46] By the end of the following year, he had formulated its structure, divided in three parts: (1) *antiquitates sacrae* in their genesis, (2) literary criticism of the Pentateuch, and (3) criticism of the historical books of the Old Testament. The author imagined, "It should become a kind of critical foundation to a history of Israel."[47] Yet Wellhausen issued separate studies in the end. Though reprinted as tome two of his own *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (1885), the second part, entitled *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, first featured in issues twenty-one (1876) and

as well as Eduard Riehm, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Vol. 1, *Die Thorah und die vorderen Propheten*, ed. Alexander Brandt (Halle: Strien, 1889), 145–65. Among the relatively recent disciplinary histories, Rogerson's *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century* remains a solid one – a resource all the more impressive in its meticulous detail given the analogue nature of research at the time.

[46] Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 28, 1874, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 24–25; cf. Wellhausen to Kuenen, December 18, 1875, in ibid., 33–34; Wellhausen to Kuenen, June 1, 1877, in ibid., 39; Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 5, 1878, in ibid., 47, 49. A forgotten francophone and student of Reuß in Strasbourg, the Alsatian Jacques Orth (1828–1902) had analyzed Ezekiel and the Pentateuch and received citation from Wellhausen (idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 4 n. 1, 421; see further Thompson, *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf*, 34): see Orth's "La tribu de Lévi et la Loi," *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie* 3 (1859): 384–400; "La centralisation du culte de Jéhovah," *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie* 4 (1859): 350–60; and bachelor's thesis, *Les huit derniers chapitres d'Ézéchiel comparés au Pentateuque* (Strasbourg: Berger-Levrault, 1853), although the English *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* omits the first digit of the first page number of the first article, providing 84 rather than 384 (cf. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 4 n. 1; idem, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 4 n. 1). On the abandoned dedication to Vatke, see p. 142 below.

[47] Wellhausen to Kuenen, December 18, 1875, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 33–34. At the time, antiquities (*Altertümer*, *Antiquitäten*) denoted not only the products of material culture but also customs and institutions: cf. N. N., "Altertum," in *Brockhaus' Konversations-Lexikon*, 14th ed., Vol. 1, *A–Astrabad* (Berlin: Leipzig, 1896), 470. The noted Dutch orientalist Adriaan Reland (1676–1718) had published, as Hadrianus Relandus, a work beneath the title *Antiquitates sacrae veterum hebraeorum*, 1st ed. (Utrecht: Broedelet, 1708), although Wellhausen himself seems only to have cited his *Palaestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata*, 2 vols. (Utrecht: Broedelet, 1714) [Dutch Translation: *Palestina opgeheldert. Ofte de Gelegentheyd van het Joodsche Land. Uyt de Gedenkstukken der Ouden getrokken en op vaster Gronden als voorheen aangetoont en beweezen*, with an obituary on the author by Joseph Serrurier (Utrecht: Broedelet, 1719)]: cf. Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., ed. Wellhausen, 654; Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 3, *Reste arabischen Heidentumes*, 1st ed., 7 n. 2, although the reference to Reland in this latter work disappeared with the second edition, as did many citations of Smith.

twenty-two (1877) of *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*. The title left little to imagine: this inquiry centered on the composition of the Hexateuch (i. e., Genesis–Joshua). His third line of research – covering the so-called historical books (namely, Judges–Kings) – materialized as sections 81–134 in the fourth edition (1878) of Friedrich Bleek's (1793–1859) *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, which Wellhausen prepared on the basis of the third (1870), by Adolf Kamphausen (1829–1909). However, this particular analysis of his own making Wellhausen then removed from the fifth (1886) and sixth (1893) editions of the work, restoring the original portions instead.[48] In 1889, he printed both investigations together, as *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*.[49] As for that first stone of his would-be analytical substructure, *antiquitates sacrae*, Wellhausen released the initial installation the same year as his fourth edition of Bleek, publishing volume one of his intended two-tome *Geschichte Israels*. Five years later, in 1883, the second edition of that same book appeared beneath the humbler title of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*.[50] The next and final volume did not materialize for another decade, however, as *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, in 1894.

Although Wellhausen had first conceived his threefold inquiry as a critical foundation, certain exigencies forced him to redesign its timing and its architecture. Dillmann and Kayser had scooped his own work on the Hexateuch, and

[48] On Wellhausen's fourth edition, see Wellhausen to Kuenen, July 16, 1877, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 40; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, July 16, 1877, in ibid., 40–41; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, August 7, 1877, in ibid., 41–42; Wellhausen to Kuenen, October 3, 1877, in ibid., 42; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, January 1, 1878, in ibid., 42–43; Wellhausen to Kuenen, February 13, [1878,] in ibid., 43–44; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, March 9, 1878, in ibid., 44–45; Wellhausen to Kuenen, [March 29, 1878,] in ibid., 45; Wellhausen to Olshausen, March 30, 1878, in ibid., 45–46; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, September 26, 1878, in ibid., 49–50; see further Julius Wellhausen, Announcement for the fourth edition of Friedrich Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 14 (April 3, 1878): 447–48; Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., ed. Wellhausen, v; cf. Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 5th ed., ed. Wellhausen (Berlin: Reimer, 1886), v; Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 6th ed., ed. Wellhausen (Berlin: Reimer, 1893), v. The second edition of Bleek's work saw translation into English: Bleek, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2 vols., trans. G. H. Venables, ed. Edmund Venables (London: Bell and Daldy, 1869 [repr. (London: Bell and Sons, 1882)]).

[49] Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1899). See Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, December 13, 1888, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 222; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, March 21, 1889, in ibid., 225.

[50] Driver commented, for instance, "The Prolegomena, published in German in 1883, is a second edition of the first (and as yet the only) volume of the *History of Israel*, which appeared in 1878, being in fact the same work, the changes (except in chap. viii., which has been enlarged and recast) being few and rarely more than verbal. The title that the work now bears indicates that it is not a history properly so-called, but deals with the questions that must be determined before the history can be written – those, namely, relating to the character and date of the authorities, as estimated by comparison between themselves and with other writings of the Old Testament the dates of which may be assigned with certainty" (Samuel Rolles Driver, review of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, by Julius Wellhausen, *The Academy* 28, no. 690 [July 25, 1885]: 52–53, at 52).

the critic admitted he wanted to prevent anyone else from foiling him, most of all his amicable rival Bernhard Duhm (1847–1928).[51] Wellhausen had reason to be worried. In 1875, Duhm had printed his *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion*, where he contended:

> It is obvious that the Grafian Hypothesis must produce a complete revolution in the field of Old Testament theology and religious history. By erasing the 'Mosaic period,' it expands the horizon of the prophetic period to the beginnings of the actual Israelite religion and demands new explanations for the book of priestly religion and [for] Judaism.[52]

As a result, Wellhausen issued his own investigation in advance, explaining to editor Dillmann the situation and his preference for speedy publication in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*. Nonetheless, on the basis of this hextateuchal study he still planned to continue with his history of "Hebrew antiquities" – first "under whatever title" and later, subdivided into histories of cult and of tradition, as "Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels und Juda's (*sic*)."[53] Together with a third division titled "Israel und das Judentum," he conceptualized this work in its entirety "as the first critical portion of a history of Israel," with a second, descriptive volume then to follow.[54] This first volume arrived as *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, in 1878.

The author considered the tome a unified whole even without the second tome. Comments from his detractors notwithstanding, he judged it no mere "torso" but did accept a measure of criticism, agreeing the monograph did not constitute any proper history but rather a critical introduction to the subject.[55] Accordingly, he first planned to publish a *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* as a single book divided in two volumes: the one a combination of "Die Composition des Hexa-

---

[51] Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 20, 1876, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 34.

[52] Bernhard Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion* (Bonn: Marcus, 1875). Wellhausen had reviewed the volume: Julius Wellhausen, review of *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion dargestellt*, by Bernhard Duhm, *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 21 (1876): 152–58.

[53] Wellhausen to Kuenen, December 28, 1876, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 36; Wellhausen to Kuenen, June 1, 1877, in ibid., 39; cf. Wellhausen to Kuenen, July 16, 1877, in ibid., 40.

[54] Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 5, 1878, in ibid., 47, 49; cf. Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1 (Berlin: Reimer, 1878), 1.

[55] Cf. Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, November 30, 1879, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 62–63; Wellhausen to Reimer, September 24, 1882, in ibid., 110; Wellhausen to Reimer, Wellhausen to Smith, January 12, 1883, in ibid., 114–15; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, January 24, 1883, in ibid., 116; see also his preface to the second edition of *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, i. e., *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (Berlin: Reimer, 1883), iii, which appeared in neither subsequent editions nor the English translation. As potential confirmation of Wellhausen's claim, the clergy- and medical man Arnold Whitaker Oxford (1854–1948) soon composed an historical sketch on the basis of this volume together with Wellhausen's edition of *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* by Bleek and Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*: A. W. Oxford, *A Short Introduction to the History of Ancient Israel* (London: Unwin, 1887), cf. the preface.

teuchs" and "Die Composition der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments," the other *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1.[56] As he wrote his publisher, Georg Reimer (1804–1885), in 1882,

> … the critical investigations of the composition of the Pentateuch and of the historical books of the Old Testament belong to the current *Geschichte Israels* [vol.] *I* so indispensably that the plan therefore to release them together under a single title must be immediately obvious to every expert. Conversely, the presentation of Israelite history is not formally connected to what I have discussed in the first volume.[57]

This arrangement would have therefore actualized his initial formulation, from 1875, which sought to unite the study of traditions, institutions, and culture with those of the Pentateuch and of the historical books. Concerned such an integration would give the book an unbecoming "pres[s]ed (*gedrückten*) and academic character," however, he decided to issue a revised *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, on its own.[58] Furthermore, it alone constituted the *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels.* Instead of mere preliminary studies, Wellhausen's explorations of the Hexateuch and historical books therefore stand beside this *Prolegomena* as equals.[59] Any full evaluation of his method or literary analysis requires rigorous scrutiny of these two alongside, if not before, an assessment of his "*antiquitates sacrae* in their genesis" – an all too frequent omission likely owing to their complexity of language and of argument. A narrow focus on what became *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* mistakes the part for the whole. Yet even this whole was only a part. His most mature account of ancient Israel came in the second, albeit delayed, volume, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*.

If the philologist had envisaged the critical substratum to a synthetic portrait of ancient Israel already in 1875, even then he questioned his endurance to bring it to an end.[60] Although the author claimed – at least to his publisher – that second tome would demand less effort of him than the first and all the material already lay the ready, his optimism waned as time went on.[61] In early 1879, Wellhausen notified Olshausen he hoped to publish the volume and then devote himself to Semitic philology, but by August of the year thereafter, he confessed to Smith a lack of desire to issue the book, believing others were lying in wait to crib his work.[62] True,

---

[56] Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, July 1, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 105–06.

[57] Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, September 24, 1882, in ibid., 110; cf. Wellhausen to Reimer, September 21, 1882, in ibid., 109–10.

[58] Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, January 24, 1883, in ibid., 116; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, January 21, 1885, in ibid., 166–67; cf. also Wellhausen to Smith, May 18, 1882, in ibid., 103.

[59] Cf. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 8 n. 2.

[60] Wellhausen to Kuenen, December 18, 1875, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 33–34.

[61] So, e. g., Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, October 11, 1878, in ibid., 51; Wellhausen to Reimer, November 30, 1879, in ibid., 62–63.

[62] Wellhausen to Olshausen, February 18, 1879, in ibid., 57–58; Wellhausen to Smith, August 14, 1880, in ibid., 75. He also mentioned the possibility of first publishing it in English: Wellhausen to Smith, May 18, 1882, in ibid., 103.

when one English-speaking commentator suggested, in 1881, that Wellhausen would not be able to finish the task, he corrected the record immediately, denying any outside pressure to refrain from pressing forth and expecting a release in the not-too-distant future.[63] Soon afterwards, however, the young professor admitted to Reuß that he had labored little in the Old Testament since 1878 and saw dim prospects for completion of that second opus within the coming decade.[64] The next year, the number of inquiries had apparently grown so great that Wellhausen felt compelled to make a public announcement, in the *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*: neither a subsequent tome nor a second edition of the sold-out first would appear anytime soon.[65] However, he soon floated the idea of producing such a new edition for *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, which arrived the following year, albeit newly titled.[66] There he was sure to insist, however, that this work could stand on its own and still serve as a critical basis for a positive construction.[67]

When Wellhausen finally did produce his follow-up, the story of ancient Israel he told occasioned rather small surprise. His constructive history had, in fact, already appeared in several shorter iterations.[68] Between *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, and its later manifestation as *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, he penned an article first conceived as "Jewish History" but printed as "Israel" for the ninth edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica*, in 1881. Now, portions of this essay had emerged the year before in a private German edition, again entitled *Geschichte Israels*. This version underwent revision and publication, in 1884, as a component to volume one of his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, beneath the title *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's*, despite the bastard title *Geschichte Israels*

---

[63] See "Robertson Smith's Lectures," *The Athenæum* 2795 (May 21, 1881), 683–84, at 683; "Literary Gossip," *The Athenæum* 2803 (July 16, 1881), 80–82, at 82. Smith penned the statement on his behalf: cf. Wellhausen to Smith, June 27, 1881, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 84–85; Wellhausen to Smith, July 17, 1881, in ibid., 86; cf. also Wellhausen to Kuenen, June 14, 1881, in ibid., 82–84;

[64] Wellhausen to Reuß, September 24, 1881, in ibid., 90–91. Wellhausen disputed attribution of the so-called Grafian hypothesis to Reuß, insisting on printed documentation for claims of origination: cf. Wellhausen to Jülicher, November 27, 1883, in ibid., 134–35; Wellhausen to Stade, February 27, 1905, in ibid., 447–48.

[65] Julius Wellhausen, untitled announcement, *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 33, no. 18 (April 29 [dated March], 1882): 620.

[66] Cf. Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, July 1, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 105–06; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, January 12, 1883, in ibid., 114–15.

[67] See Wellhausen's preface to the first edition of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (i. e., the second edition of *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1), iii.

[68] For more elaboration on this genesis, see Smend, "Julius Wellhausen and His *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*," in *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, ed. Knight; idem, "Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. Zur Entstehung von Julius Wellhausens Buch," in *Geschichte–Tradition–Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, Vol. 1, *Judentum*, ed. Peter Schäfer (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996), 36–42; idem, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," 443–50; cf. also the details given for the individual bibliographic entries in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 818–37.

und Juda's im Umriss. (The German text was soon translated into Norwegian.[69]) As for the English version of this article, it saw reprinting as an appendix to the 1885 translation *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* and went to market separately as *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah* six years later. (The sixth edition of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* was also translated into Russian and reprinted during the author's lifetime.[70]) Yet both these reprints of the essay now included – albeit with different sequencing – a section under the heading "Judaism and Christianity," which had first appeared in the German *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's*. As for that much awaited second tome, i. e., a full synthetic account of ancient Israel, Wellhausen finally did release his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte,* but only in 1894, having returned – as the professor of oriental languages at Göttingen – to both the field of study and the university (though not the faculty) of his earliest academic treatise.[71] This history

[69] Julius Wellhausen, *Israels og Judas historie i korthed* (Bibliothek for de tusen hjem 335–38; Høvik: Sørensen, 1889). The series also featured translations of such notable works as Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, Washington Irving's *The Sketch Book*, Thomas Carlyle's *The French Revolution: A History*, Henry Thomas Buckle's *History of Civilization in England*, Immanuel Kant's "Perpetual Peace," and Charles Darwin's *Life and Letters*.

[70] Julius Wellhausen [Vell'gauzen], *Vvedenie v istoriyu Izrailya*, trans. Nikolai Mikhailovich Nikolsky (St. Petersburg: Piramida, 1909). Wellhausen's thought in particular and that of biblical criticism in general found a broker in Izrail' Frank-Kamenetskij (1880–1947), who had studied with him among many others in the German-speaking lands: see Brandist, "Semantic palaeontology and the passage from myth to science and poetry: the work of Izrail' Frank-Kamentskij (1880–1937)."

[71] For a full documentation of the project's evolution and appraisal, see Wellhausen to Abraham Kuenen, December 18, 1875, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 33–34; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, October 11, 1878, in ibid., 51; Wellhausen to Kuenen, [March 5, 1879,] in ibid., 58–59; Wellhausen to Smith, June 6, 1879, in ibid., 59; Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 9, 1879, in ibid., 59–60; Wellhausen to Smith, August 16, 1879, in ibid., 61–62; Wellhausen to Kuenen, November 25, 1879, in ibid., 62; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, November 30, 1879, in ibid., 62–63; Wellhausen to Smith, June 3, 1880, in ibid., 68–69; Wellhausen to Smith, August 14, 1880, in ibid., 74; Wellhausen to Jülicher, November 8, 1880, in ibid., 78; Wellhausen to Kuenen, June 14, 1881, in ibid., 82–84; Wellhausen to Smith, June 27, 1881, in ibid., 84–85; Wellhausen to Smith, July 9, 1881, in ibid., 85–86; Wellhausen to Smith, August 11, 1881, in ibid., 87–88; Wellhausen to Eduard Reuß, September 24, 1881, in ibid., 90–91; Wellhausen to Smith, November 16, 1881, in ibid., 91–92; Wellhausen to Socin, May 12, 1882, in ibid., 101–02; Wellhausen to Smith, May 18, 1882, in ibid., 103; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, July 1, 1882, in ibid., 105–06; Wellhausen to Smith, [Summer 1882,] in ibid., 107; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, September 24, 1882, in ibid., 110; Wellhausen to Smith, January 12, 1883, in ibid., 114–15; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, January 24, 1883, in ibid., 116; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, September 19, 1887, in ibid., 208; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, September 21, 1887, in ibid., 209–10; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, December 13, 1888, in ibid., 222; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, February 12, 1894, in ibid., 313; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, March 1, 1894, in ibid., 313–14; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, March 16, 1894, in ibid., 314; Wellhausen to Justi, June 2, 1894, in ibid., 315; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, July 8, 1894, in ibid., 317; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, July 10, 1894, in ibid., 318; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, September 26, 1894, in ibid., 320–21; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, October 19, 1894, in ibid., 322; Wellhausen to Konrad Furrer, October 21, 1894, in ibid., 322–23; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, October 30, 1894, in ibid., 323; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, [November 8/9,

went through seven editions in his lifetime (like the six of his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*), but over a century later, it remains untranslated in English. About a decade later, he delivered an abridgment for Hinneberg's *Die Christliche Religion, mit einem Einschluss der israelitisch-jüdischen Religion*, called "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion." In this way, the final history he wrote amounted to an elaboration. Despite these multiple iterations, the narrative underwent small substantial change, although his second volume added more on geography and ethnography and the article "Israel," exceptionally, encompassed the modern period.[72]

In 1882, amidst the campaign to shift to a faculty of philosophy, the emergent semitist reported to the Prussian Ministry of Culture he had for years already focused on ancient Arabs as well as formative Islam.[73] Three years prior, the hebraist had divulged to Kuenen he had not yet started the second tome, having found himself engrossed in Arabic, Carlyle, and Goethe, which meant he only wrote when inspiration struck.[74] As that book appeared, Wellhausen expressed his longtime lack of lust for completing it and conveyed a certain level of disappointment in the work.[75] By that point, he had proved himself an able arabist. His efforts in Hebrew Bible after *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* consisted mostly of revisions for new editions or publications of older material.[76] Indeed, the story he had to tell remained the same: a Hebrew nation rose and fell.

1894,] in ibid., 324; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, November 27, 1894, in ibid.; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, December 16, 1894, in ibid., 325; Wellhausen to Justi, January 24, 1895, in ibid., 328–29; Wellhausen to Justi, June 1, 1895, in ibid., 330–31; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, June 16, 1895, in ibid., 331; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, September 13, 1895, in ibid., 332–33; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, in ibid., 333.

[72] The article ended with an oft forgotten statement: "The persistency of the race may of course prove a harder thing to overcome than Spinoza has supposed, but nevertheless he will be found to have spoken truly in declaring that the so-called emancipation of the Jews must inevitably lead to the extinction of Judaism wherever the process is extended beyond the political and the social sphere. For accomplishment of this centuries may be required" (Wellhausen, "Israel," 548); cf. p. 56 n. 147 supra.

[73] Cf. Wellhausen to the Ministry of Culture, April 5, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 98–99; see also, e. g., Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, December 2, 1881, in ibid., 92–93.

[74] See Wellhausen to Kuenen, [March 5, 1879,] in ibid., 58; Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 9, 1879, in ibid., 59–60; cf., inter alia, Wellhausen to Michael Jan de Goeje, December 20, 1879, in ibid., 64–65; Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, June 23, 1880, in ibid., 70.

[75] Cf. Wellhausen to Furrer, October 21, 1894, in ibid., 322–23; cf. also Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, October 19, 1894, in ibid., 322; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, [November 8/9, 1894,] in ibid., 324; Wellhausen to Justi, June 1, 1895, in ibid., 330–31.

[76] Wellhausen did continue to write reviews in the field, although he complained of having to leaf through so many books on the Old Testament just to be able to thank their authors for sending him copies (cf. Wellhausen to Smith, November 1, 1891, in ibid., 269–70).

2.3 History as Nationcraft

If Wellhausen hoped to reconstruct the past of that ancient nation known as Israel, he had to find its origins. But the philologist found his sources limited. The historian seemed to recognize the problem of prehistory in one review he authored:

> Even if it were possible to control the entire material completely, the problem of the origin of religion would not be solved by way of the history of literature, through the means of the philological method. For culture is much more ancient than all history (*Historie*); only the most recent stages of the culture are accessible to historical inquiry (*Geschichte*).[77]

While Wellhausen may have signaled little interest in accessing the fundamental elements of human social life, the genesis of his chosen nation maintained its hold upon him. So Boschwitz has observed, "… with the 'old' Arabs and the 'old' Israelites he sought an early age of the nation's being (*des Volk-Seins*), which he found nowhere else as such."[78] Indeed, Wellhausen betrayed a great attraction to those prehistoric days. Yet the past of ancient Israel ostensibly stretched beyond the reach of literary sources. This venture into a people's deeper past would require a diversion from his usual line of work, centered as it was on texts.

The task entailed an excursion into social anthropology. Now, Wellhausen was no Smith in this regard – nor even his own equal compared to his work on formative Islam. As Rogerson has outlined,

> Given the sophistication of his handling of this material [i. e. Arabian tribes and genealogies] Wellhausen's account of Israel's origins is astonishingly meagre. […] He spoke of the war camp, of religion, and of the tie of blood, without describing or analysing any social mechanisms in terms of which they might have operated, and which would have made these suggestions meaningful.[79]

For this most ancient past, Wellhausen took the biblical narrative and filled in its gaps with the sense of a semitist, before cutting it up, moving it around, and pasting down a new, allegedly historical one with his critical eye. He, like his forebears before him, developed a threefold periodization of Hebrews, Israelites, and

---

[77] Julius Wellhausen, review of *Die griechischen Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orientalischen Religionen*, by Otto Gruppe, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 9, no. 14 (1888): 507–09, at 508.

[78] Boschwitz, *Julius Wellhausen*, 11.

[79] Rogerson, "Wellhausen and Robertson Smith as Sociologists of early Arabia and ancient Israel," 59. As Rogerson also suggests, Wellhausen may well have envisaged Moses' work as comparable to how he understood that of Muhammad (ibid.). Similarly, Johannes Pedersen contends, "The basis of the development [in the spiritual history of Israel (*der geistigen Geschichte Israels*)] is, according to Wellhausen, folk religion, which he also designates as 'ethnic' or 'Paganism.' If one asks what should be understood by that, he will find in Wellhausen no obvious explanation; he simply adopted the concept, as a reminiscence of Vatke's conception, which, in turn, points to the 18th cent." (Pedersen, "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49 [1931]: 161–81, at 171–72, cf. 174).

Jews.[80] With this framework in mind – and perhaps that of the German tribes as well – the expert of primitive Semites conceptualized "the Hebrew group" as consisting of "four petty peoples" (i. e., the eventual Israelites, Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites) who, he conjectured, had formed a type of unity and together settled in southeast Palestine.[81] Although these Hebrews bore an ethnological connection to the Aramaeans of Syria, on the one hand, and the "old half-Arab" denizens of Sinai (i. e., Kenites, Amalekites, Midianites), on the other, their relationship to the so-called Canaanites was one of domination, as "foreign conquerors and lords to a subject race," even though they later did adopt their language.[82] Moreover, a sense of this filiation continued to bind these four together even after their separation from each other. Wellhausen identified "a definite reason" for the return of those Hebrew tribes who would ultimately constitute the Israelites, who had previously migrated to the far south of Palestine. When the Amorites, a people he equated with the Canaanites, imperiled the Moabites and Ammonites, these nomadic "cousins" felt motivated by "the common Hebrew cause" as well as the prospect of seizing land upon their triumph. They therefore journeyed northward, joined their Hebrew brethren, and, on the other side of victory, settled between the land of Moab and that of Ammon, thereby supplying "the link that was wanting in the chain of petty Hebrew nationalities established in the south of eastern Palestine."[83] Among the Hebrew peoples, the Moabites provided a principal point of comparison for Wellhausen as he sought to understand the history of Israel.

As for the genealogical constitution of the Israelites in particular, Wellhausen believed they had stemmed from the "unused remains" of the other emergent Hebrew peoples, "like a loose tail on a fixed body."[84] He located the true homeland of this segment in the land between Palestine and Egypt, at the desert border, where they had previously migrated and first began to cohere. Gradually,

[80] As early as 1875, de Lagarde described this division as standard (idem, *Ueber die gegenwärtige lage des deutschen reichs. ein bericht* (*sic*) (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1876), 84 [repr. in idem, *Deutsche Schriften*, 67–153].

[81] Wellhausen, "Israel," 429; cf. idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 7–8. Wellhausen provided slightly more, if still limited, detail in his English-language article "Moab," though from a different perspective: Julius Wellhausen, "Moab," in *Encyclopædia Britannica,* 9th ed., Vol. 16 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), 533–36, at 533.

[82] Wellhausen, "Israel," 429. Though not in any dedicated study or especially sustained discussion, the semitist did, on occasion, address the historical development of and the relationship between Semitic languages: see Wellhausen, review of *Hebräisch und Semitisch, Prolegomena und Grundlinien einer Geschichte der semitischen Sprachen, nebst einem Exkurs über die vorjosuanische Sprache Israels und die Pentateuchquelle PC*, by Eduard König, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 163, no. 9 (1901): 738–42; Wellhausen, "Moab," 533. The correspondence between linguistic and anthropological categories and histories as conceptualized by orientalists, Wellhausen included, merit further inquiry.

[83] Wellhausen, "Israel," 431.

[84] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 8.

these tribes, the core of future Israel, migrated further into Egyptian territory, where they maintained their language, institutions, and (semi-)nomadism but eventually fell victim to pharaonic domination, which then threatened "to take away all that was distinctive of their nationality."[85] Both in this earlier exchange with the Egyptians and in the later one with the Canaanites, Wellhausen saw confrontation with other peoples as the catalyst of national identity. This nationality, its nature and its fate, became a major preoccupation of his. Here again, however, the elemental formation of the nation extended beyond that past accessible through writing, into a far more primitive age.

More often than not, and not infrequently with force, Wellhausen argued that textual sources conveyed information first and foremost on the time of their production. This expert of ancient texts refrained from any attempt to recover the distant past of the patriarchs, deeming such legendary material as that on Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob almost entirely unreliable. But he did assent, however theoretically, to the potential of historical memory, too. As he opined with respect to nation's dawn,

> Their historical memory and therefore also [that of] their religious history cannot reach back beyond the origin of the people, especially in this case [where] a centuries-long, completely dark and empty space separates the patriarchs from the people. Accordingly, we may first begin the history of religion with the history of the people, that is, with Moses at the earliest.[86]

Accordingly, Wellhausen judged the evidence for Moses different from that for his predecessors. The chain of memory broken, the last link stretched to Moses. Even so, Wellhausen also at times permitted certain texts to serve as leverage on a still more ancient past than the time of their composition. This admirer of national architects could contend, in consequence,

> The historical tradition which has reached us relating to the period of the judges and of the kings of Israel is the main source, though only of course in an indirect way, of our knowledge of Mosaism. But within the Pentateuch itself also the *historical* tradition about Moses (which admits of being distinguished, and must carefully be separated, from the *legislative*, although the latter often clothes itself in narrative form) is in its main features manifestly trustworthy, and can only be explained as resting on actual facts. From the historical tradition, then, it is certain that Moses was the founder of the Torah. But the legislative tradition cannot tell us what were the positive contents of *his* Torah.[87]

In this view, the biblical texts provided passage – no matter how indirect or twisted – to an earlier stage of the nation's past, even before its written records. Where others fell in the history, Moses thus remained.

---

[85] Wellhausen, "Israel," 429.
[86] Wellhausen, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 7.
[87] Wellhausen, "Israel," 438, emphasis original.

Indeed, this historian of ancient Israel cast Moses as the nation's founding figure. As "the people's leader, judge, and centre of union," this architect of Israel may not have instituted *the* law, as claimed by the Hebrew Bible, but he established an early form of law and justice.[88] Wellhausen endeavored to portray "Mosaism as it must be supposed to have existed on the assumption that the history of Israel commenced with it, and that for centuries it continued to be the ideal root out of which that history continued to grow."[89] In doing so, he submitted a series of suppositions: e. g., the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, and Israelites "must at one time have formed a sort of unity and have passed through a common history"; "the basis of the unification of the tribes must certainly have been laid before the conquest of Palestine proper"; "the history of Israel must be held to have begun then [i. e., at the time of Moses], and the foundations of a new epoch to have been laid"; and "Israel's sense of national personality … must have had a great hold on the mind of the nation."[90] Yet to redeploy his own critique of Nöldeke for similarly hypothetical assertions, "What *must* have happened is of less consequence to know than what actually took place."[91] Wellhausen depicted this chaos and void from which a prime mover wrought a people with little explanation as to why the nation "must" have formed in such a way: the basis for his reconstruction of a prehistoric age stayed unarticulated. In fact, he admitted as much. As he wrote Smith, in 1879, "Moses is, of course, a cause of fruitless worry for me …. I have to forgo evidence; I can only give my view on the matter and then let the critical teeth gnaw away as much as they like."[92] Wellhausen marked Moses as the beginning of the nation nonetheless.

For this expert in ancient law and aficionado of ethical prophecy, the Hebrew prophet and lawgiver consolidated the national identity of Israel. Wellhausen maintained, "The life they had lived together under Moses had been the first thing to awaken a feeling of solidarity among the tribes which afterwards constituted the nation."[93] Moses had thus found material at the ready as he went to build the nation. Firstly, blood relations structured society. These formations – of family, house, clan, and tribe – endured from this formative period through the time of the judges up until the monarchy's demise and did much to justify the

[88] Ibid.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Ibid., 429, 432.

[91] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 46, emphasis original, cf. also 11–12, 365.

[92] Wellhausen to Smith, June 6, 1879, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 59. In a similar fashion, he reported to Smith on his article "Israel," then in progress, "I have spoken out on later Judaism in 12 pages; now I am proceeding onto the insertion of *references*. Unfortunately, my imagination (*Phantasie*) is much more active than my intellect (*Verstand*); the rationale (*Begründung*) is always unpleasant for me" (Wellhausen to Smith, January 16, 1881, in ibid., 81, italics original and English). Wellhausen also penned the entry on Moses for the ninth edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica*, which Smith had begun to edit by that time: Julius Wellhausen, "Moses," in *Encyclopædia Britannica,* 9th ed., Vol. 16 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), 860–61.

[93] Idem, "Israel," 432, cf. 438–40; see idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 10–33.

people's unity: "all legitimate community (*Gemeinschaft*) is blood community."[94] Second, no external, abstract order, authority, or governance regulated interactions among the tribes. Instead, society functioned as a "community without authority," to deploy his description of ancient Arabs.[95] Wellhausen affirmed a premise reminiscent of Émile Durkheim (1858–1917) when he asserted, "The community of blood does not operate, like the state, through compulsion. Much more, it operates through piety, through the recognition of its holiness. There is no particularly sacred (*heilige*) community: the natural community, that of blood, is the sacred one."[96] Continuing this speculation on primitive society, Wellhausen claimed an increase in the size of the community meant a replacement of blood as the unifying force: rather, the "religious idea" of the community's own holiness held the tribes together. These theories on the elemental forms of social life thus warranted his assertion "a certain inner unity actually subsisted long before it had found any outward political expression; it goes back to the time of Moses, who is to be regarded as its author."[97] But if Moses was the author, then religion was the tale.

Wellhausen conceptualized religion as a major component in Israel's national history, and Moses, the nation's founder, played a crucial role in this regard. "The foundation upon which, at all periods, Israel's sense of its national unity rested was religious in its character," he declared. "It was the faith which may be summed up in the formula, Jehovah is the God of Israel, and Israel is the people of Jehovah. Moses was not the first discoverer of this faith, but it was through him that it came to be the fundamental basis of the national existence and history."[98] Yahweh, or Jehovah in older transcription, was thus "the God at once of law and of justice, the basis, the informing principle, and the implied postulate of their

---

[94] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 22. This line of theory tied into his thinking on blood revenge among both the Arabs and the Israelites: cf. Julius Wellhausen, "Arabisch-israelitisch," in *Zum ältesten Strafrecht der Kulturvölker. Fragen zur Rechtsvergleichung*, ed. Theodor Mommsen (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1905), 91–99.

[95] Wellhausen, "Israel," 436–37; cf. Wellhausen, *Ein Gemeinwesen ohne Obrigkeit*.

[96] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 22. So, too, he asserted, "Nevertheless, the theocracy can in a certain sense be maintained as the characteristic starting point of Israelite history. Only not as a creature, as a complete institution that was suddenly forced upon the Israelites in the desert. Not as a spiritual entity that stands at a distance from the natural customs and traditions of the nation (*Volkstum*) and presupposes the opposition between holy and profane in the strongest form. Rather precisely the other way around, as the closest fusion of religion and the life of the nation, of the holy and the national, grown out of the roots already in existence and built upon the available foundation" (ibid., 20).

[97] Wellhausen, "Israel," 433.

[98] Ibid. Years earlier, Duhm had made a comparable claim, with strikingly similar wording, which gives him literary – if not perforce conceptual – priority: "Put positively, the formula Israel is the people of Yahweh and Yahweh the people of God fully expresses the entire contents of the prophetic religion" (Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion*, 96). Not known for thorough referencing, Wellhausen had reviewed this work by Duhm but offered no citation here.

national consciousness."[99] However, such coherence of nation and religion was not peculiar to Israel. The orientalist imagined a fundamental correspondence between the Hebrew peoples' deities, on the one hand, and in the very way these same peoples conceived of their own relationship to those deities, on the other – a thesis he frequently formulated.[100] This deep identification of the deity and nation was therefore common in antiquity. Indeed, Wellhausen insisted on the most basic similarity among Semites in general, Hebrews in particular, and in fact all primitives of the ancient world, which made the problem of Israel's distinction especially perplexing:

> The religious starting-point of the history of Israel was remarkable, not for its novelty, but for its normal character. In all ancient primitive peoples the relation in which God is conceived to stand to the circumstances of the nation – in other words, religion – furnishes a motive for laws and morals; in the case of none did it become so with such purity and power as in that of the Israelites.[101]

In his contribution "Moab," written for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, he sharpened the statement further: "But, with all this similarity, how different were the ultimate fates of the two! The history of the one loses itself obscurely and fruit-

[99] Wellhausen, "Israel," 434. As he elaborated in a passage worth citing at length, "To Moses, who had been the means of so brilliantly helping out of their first straits the Hebrews who had accompanied him out of Egypt, they naturally turned in all subsequent difficulties; before him they brought all affairs with which they were not themselves able to cope. The authority which his antecedents had secured for him made him as matter of course the great national 'Kadhi' [sc. Qadi] in the wilderness. Equally as matter of course did he exercise his judicial functions, neither in his own interest nor in his own name, but in the interest of the whole community and in the name of Jehovah. By connecting them with the sanctuary of Jehovah, which stood at the well of Kadesh, he made these functions independent of his person, and thus he laid a firm basis for consuetudinary law and became the originator of the Torah in Israel. In doing this he succeeded in inspiring the national being with that which was the very life of his own soul; through the Torah he gave a definite positive expression to their sense of nationality and their idea of God" (ibid.).

[100] Cf., inter alia, Julius Wellhausen, review of *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte. Der Gott Israels und die Götter der Heiden,* by Friedrich Baethgen, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 9, no. 37 (1888): 1321–22; idem, "Moab," 534.

[101] Wellhausen, "Israel," 437; cf. idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 235. He continued, "Whatever Jehovah may have been conceived to be in His essential nature – God of the thunderstorm or the like – this fell more and more into the background as mysterious and transcendental; the subject was not one for inquiry. All stress was laid upon His activity within the world of mankind, whose ends He made one with His own. Religion thus did not make men partakers in a divine life, but contrariwise it made God a partaker in the life of men; life in this way was not straitened by it, but enlarged. The so-called 'particularism' of Israel's idea of God was in fact the real strength of Israel's religion; it thus escaped from barren mythologisings, and became free to apply itself to the moral tasks which are always given, and admit of being discharged, only in definite spheres. As God of the nation, Jehovah became the God of justice and of right; as God of justice and right, He came to be thought of as the highest, and at last the only, power in heaven and earth" (idem, "Israel," 437–38).

lessly in the sand; that of the other issues in eternity."[102] Wellhausen may have diverged from the vast majority of his predecessors in asserting Israel had begun the same as any other Hebrew people, yet in stressing their different end, he often introduced evaluative claims that converged with his intellectual ancestors after all. Nevertheless, the philologist credited Moses with forging Israel's national cohesion in the fires of religion.

According to Wellhausen, conflict galvanized the people. "War is what makes nations," declared this Bismarck-devotee.[103] Whether Moses, who taught the tribes "to regard self-assertion against the Egyptians as an article of religion," or war with the Philistines, which served as "the forge in which the kingdom of Israel was welded into one," international engagements consolidated the tribes of ancient Israel whereas an absence of such encounters led to their loosening.[104] Wellhausen went so far as to call warfare "the most distinguished expression of the life of the nation."[105] Indeed, he emphasized this element:

> Now, at that time and for centuries afterwards, the highwater (*sic*) marks of history were indicated by the wars it recorded. The name "Israel" means "El does battle," and Jehovah was the warrior El, after whom the nation styled itself. The camp was, so to speak, at once the cradle in which the nation was nursed and the smithy in which it was welded into unity; it was also the primitive sanctuary. There Israel was, and there was Jehovah. If in times of peace the relations between the two had become dormant, they were at once called forth into fullest activity when the alarm of danger was raised; Israel's awakening was always preceded by the awakening of Jehovah.[106]

Such an understanding of the nation's self-understanding then warranted his claim "[r]eligion and patriotism were then identical."[107] As the fullest manifestation of national life, war initially pulled the tribes back to Palestine, brought them together under the judges, and ultimately formed them into a kingdom beneath the first two monarchs, Saul and David.

For this later period in the life of Israel, after that fuzzier one of Moses, Wellhausen deemed (at least some) biblical texts reliable as a source for such an ancient age of conquest and confederation. Wellhausen – who had lived through the Revolutions of 1848, the First and Second Schleswig Wars (1848–1851, 1864), the

---

[102] Wellhausen, "Moab," 535. In addition, he discussed the linguistic and epigraphic dimensions of Moabite: see esp. ibid., 536; idem, review of *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik, nebst ausgewählten Inschriften*, Vol. 1, *Texte*, Vol. 2, *Tafeln*, by Mark Lidzbarski, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 161, no. 8 (1899): 602–08.

[103] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 23.

[104] Wellhausen, "Israel," 430, 453. The German version of this article has somewhat stronger language than the English one in describing the militaristic dimension of the bond between these tribes: cf. ibid., 447–48; idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 1.1, *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's*, 19.

[105] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 23,

[106] Wellhausen, "Israel," 434–35, cf. 448. Wellhausen specified that Moses had not himself created a proper state (ibid., 436).

[107] Ibid., 449.

Austro-Prussian War (1866), the North German Confederation (1867–71), the Franco-Prussian War (1870–71), and the foundation of the German Empire all before assuming his first professorship – thought much of unification even in antiquity. He described the seer Samuel as a man troubled by the "national distress" and provoked by the enemies of Israel, who had learned from the surrounding peoples "to recognise the advantages which are secured by the consolidation of families and tribes into a kingdom" and whose "peculiar merit lay, not in discovering what it was that the nation needed, but in finding out the man who was capable of supplying that need."[108] Rather than tackle internal affairs, this figure, Saul, prioritized matters of war – "at once the business and the resource of the new kingdom."[109] When a dubious David ascended to the throne, he finished the venture that Saul had begun – namely, liberation from the Philistines. After this defensive undertaking, which Wellhausen proclaimed "undoubtedly the greatest achievement of his reign," David launched aggressive campaigns abroad and then quelled insurrection at home.[110] The historian credited these two for having "made out of the Hebrew tribes a real people in the political sense" and providing the nation with "its historical self-consciousness."[111] Warrior kings, in his account, had made a state out of a nation.

After the formation of a nation and the foundation of a kingdom, Wellhausen described a shift towards statecraft. A "new creation" of "natural beginnings," the state – i. e., the monarchy – represented "the soil out of which all the other institutions of Israel grow up."[112] The new king, Solomon, boasted nothing of the military prowess possessed by his predecessors – a man whose "glory was not purchased on the battlefield" and who not only faced revolt from once subjugated peoples but also allowed a new kingdom to rise in the north – yet he did prove himself able with internal affairs.[113] He partitioned the kingdom into provinces, devolved responsibilities onto governors, which marked "a beginning of vigorous and orderly administration," grew the royal treasury, and launched extensive building projects to rival other kingdoms.[114] As Wellhausen chronicled this history, the outward-looking king brought stability and order by his administration while further engagement with other peoples opened "the floodgate … for the

[108] Ibid.

[109] Ibid., 450–51.

[110] Ibid., 453. By the same token, Wellhausen hailed Abu Muslim as "the Iranian Bismarck, who broke the yoke of Arabian hegemony and this for all time" (Wellhausen to Justi, March 30, 1900, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 382–83, at 382); see also his positive association of Bismarck and Carlyle in Wellhausen to Smith, [October 1881,] in ibid., 93, 95. Apropos of Bismarck, Wellhausen even complimented his German: cf. Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 2, 1905, in ibid., 463–65, at 463.

[111] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 413. For Wellhausen's contrasting appraisal of Jewish military prowess, cf. Kurtz, "The Way of War," 14–17.

[112] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 413.

[113] Wellhausen, "Israel," 456.

[114] Ibid.

admission of Oriental civilisation in a deeper and wider sense."[115] Here again, however, the historian imagined a corresponding increase in national identity as a consequence: "Closer intercourse with foreign lands widened the intellectual horizon of the people, and at the same time awakened it to a deeper sense of its own peculiar individuality."[116]

If Wellhausen seemed to tell a happy story of Israel's early history – the unification of tribes, consolidation of national consciousness, establishment of a kingdom, and management of a state – he narrated a more ambivalent one of the generations that followed. First and foremost, a unified kingdom split into two upon the death of Solomon, with Israel in the north and Judah in the south. Whatever the tremendous commonalities among them, Wellhausen – who himself was living in an age characterized by booming industrialization, a swelling population, and growing urbanization – did outline some differences between the two as well, juxtaposing a cosmopolitan north and a far more rural south. As an example of the value he assigned to strong connections between society and land, the same man who called himself "far more of a gardener than a professor" suggested, "Life in Judah [*vis-à-vis* Israel] was a much more stable affair, though not so exciting or dramatic. Possibly the greater isolation of the little kingdom, its more intimate relations with the neighbouring wilderness, and the more primitive modes of life which resulted, were also factors which contributed to this general result."[117] Prof. Dr. Wellhausen further asserted the strength of the monarchy granted a certain durability to institutions in Judah, as opposed to those of Israel, where individuals held more sway. In lines added to his full-length history, present in neither the English nor the German version of the article "Israel," he further explained, "The Judaean aristocracy seems to have restricted the royalty less than the Israelite one."[118] Although his beloved prophets did indeed take center stage in this act of the story, political fortunes mostly took a turn for the worse, pushed and pulled by pressures internal and external alike. "Decay set in even at the separation," he recounted, "and when once the Assyrians were heard at the door, it advanced with steps not to be arrested."[119] So it was that Hebrew tribes first formed into nation and then united into a nation-state beneath a powerful monarchy – only to collapse upon division.

---

[115] Ibid., 456–57.

[116] Ibid. 457.

[117] Wellhausen, "Israel," 478. Wellhausen described himself as such in a letter to his in-laws: Wellhausen to the Limprichts, [May 17, 1896,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 339–40; cf., inter alia, Wellhausen to Socin, December 10, 1889, in ibid., 241.

[118] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 117.

[119] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 414.

2.4 Theocracy Unbound

Wellhausen's interest in law extended well beyond the composition histories of the Hebrew Bible or the foundation of institutions in ancient Israel. Interpreters have missed how much the study of law directed the historian's understanding of antiquity, far more than any mere tool to reorder the chronology of the biblical texts. After all, this was the orientalist who received a Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*, from the University of Greifswald as well as that of Edinburgh, in the year 1906.[120] The same scholar who devoted so much time and energy to the Mosaic law's formation also studied the inception of legal codes amongst the Arabs, producing, for example, one contribution to a volume – organized by Mommsen – on criminal justice in primitive society and another on Muhammed's constitution of Medina.[121] So, too, he addressed the topic in his lecture for the Kaiser.[122] Indeed, this doctor of jurisprudence considered law an essential element in the history of human society. Wellhausen plainly stated he needed no excuse to publish a study of ancient legal matters in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, "for law is sanctified all over through forms that derive from religion. Ancient religion clearly led no segregated Sunday life but penetrated all areas of doing and dealing."[123] In his expression of gratitude to the Greifswald Faculty, moreover, he went so far as to declare, "… among the ancient peoples with whom I have chiefly occupied myself, it [sc. law] ranks nearly on par with religion and morality."[124] If Wellhausen the onetime Lutheran theologian did display a certain aversion to religious codes and while the historian in him showed substantial interest in the rise of institutions,

[120] See pp. 32–33 supra.

[121] Wellhausen, "Arabisch-israelitisch," in *Zum ältesten Strafrecht der Kulturvölker*, ed. Mommsen; Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 4.2, *Muhammads Gemeindeordnung von Medina* (Berlin: Reimer, 1889), with this text going into English translation as an excursus to Arent Jan Wensinck's *Muhammad and the Jews of Medina*, trans. and ed. Wolfgang Behn, 1st ed. (Islamkundliche Materialien 3; Freiburg: Schwarz, 1975), which itself first hit the market as *Mohammed en de Joden te Medina* (Leiden: Brill, 1908).

[122] He concluded his address with the following words: "On account of having it for so long [i.e, a firm legal order independent of the individual], we are accustomed to viewing it as something given by nature, which cannot be eliminated at all. This trust is admittedly false, but it is a compliment for the order existing among us. It is taken for granted among us that law and power (*Macht*) harmonize; with us, power does not refuse to surrender to law. We must thank God for that; we must be thankful to have a king who, like him, secures peace against the outside, also demands peace within, and protects the weak against the strong. And I call upon you, at this ceremonious occasion that recurs each year, to join in the old exclamation: His Majesty the Kaiser, our Most Gracious King and Lord, may he live – High, High, High!" (Wellhausen, *Ein Gemeinwesen ohne Obrigkeit*, 16).

[123] Julius Wellhausen, "Zwei Rechtsriten bei den Hebräern," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 7 (1904): 33–41, at 41.

[124] Wellhausen to the Faculty of Law at the University of Greifswald, August 9, 1906, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 490, where he signed his name "*Dr. jur. & philos Gryphisvald*" (ibid., italics original). He added in the postscript, "We should actually also have the title *master of the battlefield* (as the Cid is called) for the military," producing the Latin *Doctor campi* (ibid.).

the liberal bourgeois professor also betrayed an appreciation for the ordered governance of the state and for limits to the power and prerogatives of the crown.

Wellhausen sought to measure the depths of that complex interrelationship between religion and politics in society over time, and for this undertaking legal transformations often acted as his plumb line. He examined how religion could lie at the base of a nation's identity, how national consciousness emerged, how a nation formed into a state, and how religion later functioned independent of that state. Changes in national life therefore corresponded to specific transformations in conceptions of law and deity alike. He aimed to trace those contours. Through his analysis of texts – together with speculations on social anthropology – the savant pursued such questions from ancient Israel through early Judaism to primitive Christianity and in formative Islam. This line of inquiry appeared in its full trajectory as he examined the longer history of Israel.

As one means of gaining purchase on this history, to differentiate the actual ancient past from its representation in written sources, Wellhausen scrutinized conceptions of "theocracy." Here, he addressed the nature of the nation-state as well. His most sustained discussion of the subject appeared in the final chapter of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, titled "The Theocracy as Idea and as Institution" and bisected into sections titled, tellingly, "Freshness and naturalness of early Israelite history" and "Foundation of the theocratic constitution under the foreign domination." He first saw a problem of terminology. Flavius Josephus had coined the term theocracy, he argued, but in doing so imagined the "sacred community" of his own day, which did not correspond to a conception true of ancient Israel. Criticizing an undisciplined deployment of the lexeme and its derivatives among his contemporaries, Wellhausen praised Vatke for having "traced through the centuries the rise of the theocracy and the metamorphosis of the idea to an institution."[125] (Despite such criticism, he himself could show a lack of discipline in nomenclature.[126]) Wellhausen described an historical progression: from "patriarchal anarchy" through theocracy as he came to re-define it – a "particularism" characterized by an identification of deity and nation and by no distinction between the secular and the spiritual, as a political system and institutional structures were beginning to take shape – to the kind of theocracy

[125] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 411. He explained, "It is a simple and yet a very important remark of Vatke, that the sacred constitution of the congregation, so circumstantially described to us in the Priestly Code, is after all very defective, and presupposes the existence of that which it was the chief task of the age of Moses to bring about, namely the state, in the absence of which the church cannot have any subsistence either" (ibid., 412). Though without specific documentation, as usual, Wellhausen presumably refers here to Vatke, *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt*, Vol. 1, Part 1, *Die Religion des Alten Testamentes nach den kanonischen Büchern entwickelt* (Berlin: Bethge, 1835), 204–12.

[126] For a scrutiny of such language across Wellhausen's corpus, see Ernst Michael Dörrfuss, *Mose in den Chronikbüchern. Garant theokratischer Zukunftserwartung* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 219; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 64–76.

as imagined by Josephus, which implied a separation of sacred and profane, represented a form of constitution, and amounted to hierocracy (or "hierarchy").[127] In view of such terminological difficulty, he proposed abandoning "theocracy" altogether: what the author of *Antiquities of the Jews* had designated should instead be called a "church," i. e., a religious community that presupposes a state. As Wellhausen composed a longer history of Israel, he told the story of such drastic reconceptualizations.

If Wellhausen periodized the ancient Israelites between an earlier Hebrew people and a later Jewish one, this second division turned into a chasm. Like Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849) a generation before him – who himself was not without antecedents – he drew a rather sharp distinction between Israel and Judaism.[128] In the reprints of Wellhausen's article "Israel," a formal move from the section titled "Jeremiah and the destruction of Jerusalem" to the next, "The captivity and the restoration," correlated to one of content as well: from this point onward, the author spoke of the Jews. The transition was all the more marked in his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, which contained two separate chapters: "The Jews in Exile" and "The Restoration."[129] Yet betrayal of such a narrative on the level of structure – as well as the author's own verdict upon it – proved to be most manifest in (*Prolegomena to the*) *History of Israel*: divided in three parts, the work signaled this severance by epigraph. Embarking on Part 1, entitled "History of the Ordinances of Worship," the biblical scholar encapsulated the second chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans in the simple statement "Not having the law, they do by nature the work of the law" (*Legem non habentes natura faciunt legis opera*).[130] To introduce Part 2, "History of Tra-

[127] He referred to the "hierarchies" of the rabbis and Rome alike (cf. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 412; idem, "Israel," 540).

[128] More precisely, de Wette distinguished these two phases as "Hebraism" and "Judaism": see idem, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik in ihrer historischen Entwickelung dargestellt,* Vol. 1, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments, Oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judentums und Urchristenthums, Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*, 1st ed. (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1813); on the impact of this lens for later historiography, cf. Lothar Perlitt, "Hebraismus – Deuteronomismus – Judaismus," repr. in idem, *Deuteronomium-Studien* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 8; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994), 247–60.

[129] These subtitles first appeared in the articles's reprint of 1885, i. e., in the translation of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. In the corresponding discussion of his fuller history of Israel, Wellhausen did refer to the Jews on at least one other, earlier, occasion: idem, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 137. His *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* showed much less consistency in language, especially with the English translation (cf., e. g., idem, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 446; idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 420–21).

[130] In 1878, the same year he published *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, Wellhausen added the same quotation to his fourth edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (178). Salo Stein included this paraphrase in his own dissertation, *Materialien zur Ethik des Talmud*, Vol. 1, *Die Pflichtenlehre des Talmud*, which a review condemned rather harshly: "I suspect the auth[or] picked up this quotation from some Catholic writer and did not understand the reference. That a young and, even further, orthodox Jewish theologian consciously prefixed as a motto to his work a sentence from the Apostle Paul's letter to the Romans I would certainly not want to

dition," the philhellenist cited Hesiod's *Works and Days*: "The half is better than the whole" (Πλέον ἥμισυ παντός).[131] The Grafian opened Part 3, "Israel and Judaism," and thereby closed the book with a quote from his former hero Vatke: "The law came in between" (*Das Gesetz ist zwischenein getreten*).[132] Though perhaps softened by hyphenation in his later essay "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," the separation between Israel and Judaism became a powerful model for understanding the biblical literature and, with it, the ancient past. Long operative in Christian theology, the demarcation thus became one of history.

This historian of antiquity, who wrote in the wake of German unification, placed a premium on national-political autonomy. The loss of self-determination created a divide between the nation of Israel and the religion of Judaism, which then warranted his distinction of epochs. Describing a destruction of the state, a separation from the homeland, and a privation of national identity, Wellhausen narrated such an evolution (or rather devolution). Captivity was fracture. The deportation "violently tore the nation away from its native soil, and kept it apart for half a century, – a breach of historical continuity than which it

---

consider likely. The author should also know the letters of Paul were written in Greek, not Latin" ([Heinrich Graetz?] in *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 41, n.s. 5 [1897]: 239–40, at 240).

[131] As Ryan Krieger Balot writes, "This quotation became a trademark of those railing against an acquisitive and exploitative elite" (idem, *Greed and Injustice in Classical Athens* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001], 72); cf. also the interpretation in Arthur Schopenhauer, "On Style," in idem, *The Art of Literature: A Series of Essays,* ed. and trans. T. Bailey Saunders, 1st ed. (Schopenhauer Series 4; London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1891), at 29–30, although this reference to Hesiod first came in the second edition of the German original (cf. "Ueber Schriftstellerei und Stil," in idem, *Parerga und Paralipomena. Kleine philosophische Schriften*, 1st ed., 2 vols. [Berlin: Hahn, 1851], at 2:437; 2nd ed., 2 vols., ed. Julius Frauenstädt [Berlin: Hahn, 1862], at 2:558).

[132] At base, the phrase echoes Romans 5:20. In the first and second editions of the work, Wellhausen cited "Vatke Pg. 183" – a reference he removed in the third edition, of 1886 – although the original quotation ran, more precisely: *Das tiefe Idee des Neuen Testaments, daß das Gesetz zwischen die Verheißungen und deren Erfüllung hineingetreten sei, läßt sich dessenungeachtet historisch rechtfertigen, da ja der Pentateuch in seiner Vollendung in der That später fällt, als die Verheißungen der meisten Propheten* (Wilhelm Vatke, *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt*, Vol. 1, Part 1, *Die Religion des Alten Testamentes nach den kanonischen Büchern entwickelt*, 183; only this volume of Vatke's work appeared, and even then only its first part). Explicating Wellhausen's own explanation of the Pauline verse, which he provided in *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, but not in subsequent editions, Ran HaCohen writes, " … Paul's statement meant to argue that the Law had been given to the Israelites during the days of Moses, in between the Law-less period before Moses and the Law-less period that Jesus ushered in. Wellhausen, on the other hand, argued that the Law – the same law, the Law of Judaism – entered *historically* (gradually) in the period after the exile, between the ancient Law-less period and that begun by Jesus (which would be perfected in Protestantism), and was inserted *historiographically* into that period, as though it had existed since the days of Moses. The similarity between his historical framework and the Christian salvation history, despite their greatly differing details, was clear to Wellhausen himself" (Ran HaCohen, *Reclaiming the Hebrew Bible: German-Jewish Reception of Biblical Criticism*, trans. Michelle Engel [Studia Judaica: Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums 56; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010], 133, italics original).

is almost impossible to conceive a greater."[133] With an end to independence for the nation-state came a dependence of the religious community on an external political order – the life of the nation and that of the god continuing to diverge. As he drew the contrast between these epochs in history, "Old Israel had not shrunk to a religious congregation, public life was not quite absorbed in the service of the sanctuary; the high priest and the dwelling of Jehovah were not the centre round which all revolved …. These great changes were wrought by the destruction of the political existence first of Samaria, then of Judah."[134] Indeed, Wellhausen depicted a death of Israel bound to the birth of Judaism. "From the exile there returned, not the nation, but a religious sect," he stated, "those, namely who had given themselves up body and soul to the reformation ideas."[135] Priorities changed in consequence. The deported populations cultivated a legal garden abroad that, when transplanted back in Palestine, grew into a jungle. For this reason, Wellhausen called the Torah the "Magna Carta" of Judaism.[136]

As evident already, this portrayal of Judaism stood in stark relief to his depiction of Israel. In his reformulation of theocracy, Wellhausen described a deep bond between the nation and its god, who ruled as king – which precluded any bifurcation of the worldly and the holy. Social or political affairs were also affairs of the divine. "War and the administration of justice were regarded as matters of religion before they became matters of obligation and civil order," he wrote, "this is all that is really meant when a theocracy is spoken of."[137] He elaborated:

> Theocracy, if one may so say, arose as the complement of anarchy. Actual and legal existence (in the modern sense) was predictably only of each of the many clans; the unity of the nation was realised in the first instance only through its religion. It was out of the religion of Israel that the commonwealth of Israel unfolded itself, – not a *holy* state, but *the* state. And the state continued to be, consciously, rooted in religion, which prevented it from quitting or losing its *rapport* with the soil from which it had originally sprung.[138]

However, such conflation of the national, political, and divine did not prove specific to Israel. Wellhausen asserted the presence of this same idea in Moab.[139]

---

[133] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 28.

[134] Ibid., 422. Elsewhere, he contended, "Inasmuch as the Jews were now nothing more than a religious community, based upon the traditions of a national existence that had ceased, the rebuilding of the temple, naturally, was for them an event of supreme importance" (Wellhausen, "Israel," 494.)

[135] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 28.

[136] More specifically, he named it the "Magna Charta (*sic*) of the Jewish communion" (idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 2), the "Magna Charta (*sic*) of Judaism" (idem, "Israel," 497), and the "Magna Carta (*sic*) of the theocracy" (idem, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 14). Lou H. Silberman has stressed some of his more remarkable comments on the law: idem, "Wellhausen and Judaism," in *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, ed. Knight, 75–82.

[137] Wellhausen, "Israel," 436.

[138] Wellhausen, "Israel," 436–37.

[139] Cf. Wellhausen, "Moab," esp. 534.

The historian of antique nations thus averred, "Theocracy is nothing more than what used to be called particularism."[140] Moreover, he maintained a continuity between an earlier age of cohering Hebrew tribes and that of the kingdom's founding. In consequence, however great its political implications or its consolidation of national identity, the formation of a state did not undermine but in fact embodied this primitive convergence of deity and nation. As the professorial appointee of the Prussian state averred, "… the kingship of Jehovah, in that precise sense which we associate with it, is the religious expression of the fact of the foundation of the kingdom by Saul and David. The theocracy was the state of itself; the ancient Israelites regarded the civil state as a miracle, or, in their own words, a help of God."[141] In Wellhausen's account, a nation's social and political life intimately entwined with that of its religion.

Now, to arrive at these conclusions – the story of a nation at its origins, the fate of an ancient kingdom, and the fracture between Israel and Judaism – Wellhausen had scrutinized and leveraged tensions within and across the biblical texts, informed by what he thought to be true of human, especially Semitic, society more broadly. Based on his threefold inquiry into the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch), the historical books, and the genesis of institutions, Wellhausen believed the overarching narrative of the Hebrew Bible in fact betrayed a rewriting – or, still more forcefully, a distorting – of Israel's ancient past by later Jewish writers, who had projected either the current state of affairs or simply their fantasies of an idealized existence back onto an earlier age. As cogent as it is sophisticated, Daniel Weidner's analysis of the critical work by Wellhausen (along with its reception) has clearly formulated the interaction of these dimensions the philologist perceived in the text, which fundamentally differed in their representation of the past:

> In Wellhausen's reading, there are therefore *two* origins of theocracy, which are both in a certain sense beyond history. As a Mosaic institution, theocracy originated only in later generations' redaction of stories of their past and was projected backward in history. But as an idea of immediate divine authority, the origin of theocracy is always already lost, visible only in the remnants of older customs and unstable on account of its intermittent nature, since after Israel's military victories, the people would return to idolatrous practices …. The permanent tension and conflict between these two origins produce the actual history of Israel, which is thus by no means a progressive history, but rather one of constant instability.[142]

---

[140] Wellhausen, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 9. An encapsulation of his larger historiographical endeavors, this essay cut to the chase in addressing the question of theocracy: "Yahweh the God of Israel and Israel the people of Yahweh – that is what one must understand as theocracy if the name is to mean anything proper" (ibid.).

[141] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 414; cf. idem, "Israel," 432.

[142] Daniel Weidner, "The Political Theology of Ethical Monotheism," in *Judaism, Liberalism, and Political Theology*, ed. Randi Rashkover and Martin Kavka (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014), 178–96, at 186–87, emphasis original. As Weidner further details, in a passage worth citing at length, "Wellhausen reads the biblical text on different levels: on the level of a manifest representation of Israel's salvation history in which Moses precedes the prophets, and

The critic judged the law the crux for understanding such a past, of the nation and the literature alike. As he opened *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*,

> In the following pages it is proposed to discuss the place in history of the 'law of Moses;' more precisely, the question to be considered is whether the law is the starting-point for the history of ancient Israel, or not rather for that of Judaism, *i. e.*, of the religious communion which survived the destruction of the nation by the Assyrians and Chaldæans.[143]

In the end, the history of Israel was not a story of some sacred, divine law revealed on Sinai and a people's persistent failure to observe it but an earthier, more human one: the creation of a nation, formation of institutions, and foundation of a state, together with its ultimate demise. The law of Moses offered him purchase on this contrast between a reputed degeneration as narrated by certain biblical texts and the development he saw elsewhere and, no less decisively, knew must have taken place. Law therefore acted as the wedge between Israel and Judaism.

Interpreters of Wellhausen have oft perceived the reconstruction of *lex post prophetas* as law versus prophecy, an antithesis of the strongest sort. Already then, opponents re-described the critic's account of the relation between the two as a near binary opposition, and such a characterization still echoes over a century later, with one scholar writing, representatively, in an essay meant to problematize this opposition among contemporary researchers, "Wellhausen sought to depict prophecy and the law as two distinct and, indeed, mutually

---

as a symptom of the true religious development in which the prophets precede Moses. To use a formulation from Walter Benjamin, he reads the biblical story 'against the grain,' that is, he looks for symptoms of another story that runs counter to the story the biblical text manifestly narrates. However, this new story is never separate from the old one, for it not only consists of the same elements, but it also has to take into account the manifest story of the original tradition and explain how it actually came into being. Thereby, the text and its 'true' history remain in a relationship that is full of tension, mediating the fundamental contradictions between political history and salvation history, between institutional kingship and individual prophet into the process of reading. It is the tension between politics and morals that organizes Wellhausen's reading in an ambiguous way. On the one hand, moral and religious texts tend to hide and distort the natural and political history; on the other hand, morality becomes political in the case of prophecy. Theocracy and messianism are thus not only historic in the sense that they emerge at a specific historical epoch, but also in the sense that they inscribe history and its conflicts in the text of Scripture" (ibid., 190–91); cf. idem, "'Geschichte gegen den Strich bürsten': Julius Wellhausen und die jüdische 'Gegengeschichte,'" *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 54, no. 1 (2002): 32–61; idem, *Gershom Scholem. Politisches, esoterisches und historiographisches Schreiben* (Munich: Fink, 2003), 314–28. As one example of this detected interplay of pasts, Wellhausen contended, "Chronicles, on the other hand, not only takes the Law – the Pentachal (*sic*) Law as a whole, but more particularly the Priestly Code therein preponderating – as its rule of judgment on the past, but also idealises the facts in accordance with that norm, and figures to itself the old Hebrew people as in exact conformity with the pattern of the later Jewish community, – as a monarchically graded hierocracy with a strictly centralised cultus of rigidly prescribed form at the holy place of Jerusalem" (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 189–90).

[143] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 1.

exclusive forms of religion."[144] However, at his most meticulous, Wellhausen showed a much more nuanced view. Instead of polar opposites with great evaluative charge, prophecy and law displayed a complex genealogical relationship in the historical work he undertook. Furthermore, this relationship did not prove so neatly divisible and assignable to the two epochs of Israel and Judaism. Though not reprinted in subsequent editions, his preface to the first of *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* plainly stated, "Prophecy cannot be separated from the law, from Jewish piety, and from Christianity; [prophecy] itself already constitutes the transition from Israelite to Jewish history."[145] As another instance of this more nuanced understanding, Wellhausen submitted, "The law of the legitimate cultus of Jerusalem, as it lies before us in the Priestly Code, reforms and destroys the old popular worship on the basis of the Mosaic, *i. e.*, prophetical ideas."[146] In sharper language yet, he dubbed the prophets "the spiritual destroyers of the old Israel."[147] If the prophets had started the ball rolling, then the priests increased its momentum. Wellhausen hence bifurcated prophecy and priesthood no more than he assigned cultic activities exclusively to Judaism.[148] Certain demands of praxis secured the tie between the two.

Where this historiographer of ancient institutions discerned a continuity between priests and prophets across the divide of Israel and Judaism, he perceived

---

[144] Matthias Henze, "Invoking the Prophets in Zechariah and Ben Sira," in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427; New York: T & T Clark International, 2006), 120–34, at 120; for older literature, cf. Conrad Justus Bredenkamp, *Gesetz und Propheten. Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentlichen Kritik* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1881), which did not reject the venture of critical scholarship altogether but did, as the title suggested, uphold the chronological order of law before prophecy; and Eduard Böhl, *Zum Gesetz und zum Zeugniss. Eine Abwehr wider die neu-kritische Schriftforschung im Alten Testament* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1883), which sought to redefine law and so maintain its place in the early history of Israel.

[145] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 1st ed., v. He continued, "Judaism, as original as it is, nonetheless stands at the center of the mixture of cultures that brings antiquity to an end, which was prepared by the Assyrian-Babylonian and the Persian Empire and concluded by the Greco-Roman one. It poses the most difficult tasks for scholarship, whose solution must require a much closer alliance of theology with philology, or philology with theology, as has happened thus far" (ibid.).

[146] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 341.

[147] Wellhausen, "Israel," 491.

[148] The principal contrast in this regard centered on the type and extent – not the very existence – of cultic practice, as when he asserted, for instance, "According to the universal opinion of the pre-exilic period, the cultus is indeed of very old and (to the people) very sacred usage, but not a Mosaic institution; the ritual is not the main thing in it, and is in no sense the subject with which the Torah deals," and again, "Nothing could illustrate more clearly the contrast between the new cultus and the old; fixing its regard at all points on sin and its atonement, it reaches its culmination in a great atoning solemnity" (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 59, 112); in the note to this first quotation, he clarified, "All that is asserted is that in pre-exilian antiquity the priests' own praxis (at the altar) never constituted the contents of the Torah, but that their Torah always constituted of instruction to the laity" (ibid., 59 n. 1). In Wellhausen's account, a deep connection to the earth and agriculture marked the early cult of Israel.

a discontinuity between prophets and an older "paganism." The rupture Wellhausen saw was conditionality. Whereas a more ancient understanding had once held the nation and the deity as one, prophetic ethics disrupted such conflation. "The natural bond between the two was severed, and the relation was henceforward viewed as conditional," he argued. "As God of the righteousness which is the law of the whole universe, Jehovah could be Israel's God only in so far as in Israel the right was recognised and followed. The ethical element destroyed the national character of the old religion."[149] Consequently, Yahweh became first and foremost the god of righteousness and secondarily the god of Israel – though even then upon condition. Now joined by a covenant or treaty, the two became "contracting parties."[150] Therefore, Wellhausen called the prophets "the founders of the religion of the law, not the forerunners of the gospel,"[151] concluding, "prophets and law are no antithesis but identical and relate to each other as cause and effect."[152] However, this development unfolded only over time and resulted from international affairs. "Only when the existence of Israel had come to be threatened by the Syrians and Assyrians, did such prophets as Elijah and Amos raise the Deity high above the people, sever the natural bond between them, and put in its place a relation depending on conditions, conditions of a moral character," he wrote.[153] An additional disarticulation of the former link between the deity and people, Isaiah sought to divest Israel's religion of its national-political

[149] Wellhausen, "Israel," 473–74; cf. pp. 303–04 below. He elaborated on the implications: "In old times the nation had been the ideal of religion in actual realisation; the prophets confronted the nation with an ideal to which it did not correspond. Then to bridge over this interval the abstract ideal was framed into a law, and to this law the nation was to be conformed. The attempt had very important consequences, inasmuch as Jehovah continued to be a living power in the law, when He was no longer realised as present in the nation; but that was not what the prophets had meant to effect. What they were unconsciously labouring towards was that religious individualism which had its historical source in the national downfall, and manifested itself not exclusively within the prophetical sphere" (ibid., 491).

[150] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 418. However, Wellhausen believed the prophets did maintain the more ancient understanding of theocracy: "But the memory of the period of glory and power was all the greener, and the hope arose of its return. From the contrast between the sorrowful present and the brilliant past there arose the picture of the state as it should be; when ruin was seen without and anarchy within, the prophets set against this the pattern of theocracy. The theocracy as the prophets represent it to themselves is not a thing essentially different from the political community, as a spiritual differs from a secular power; rather, it rests on the same foundations and is in fact the ideal of the state" (ibid., 414).

[151] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 110; cf. also idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 1.1, *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's* (Berlin: Reimer, 1884), 52, although this passage – from the chapter "The Fall of Samaria" – did not appear in the earlier, privately-printed 1880 *Geschichte Israels* or English publications of "Israel."

[152] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 130. This declaration followed his claim, "Deuteronomy crowns the work of the prophets" (ibid., 129). Elsewhere he explained, "But the result of the innovation did not correspond exactly to its prophetic origin. Prophecy died when it precepts attained to the force of laws; the prophetic ideas lost their purity when they became practical" (Wellhausen, "Israel," 488; cf. idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 402–03).

[153] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 417.

character. The prophet moved the accent from political affairs, although he deferred any comprehensive legal or social reformation to a messiah yet to come, whom he envisioned in strictly temporal terms. In discriminating between a spiritual Israel and a physical one, Isaiah became – albeit unwittingly – "the man who took the first steps towards the institution of the church."[154] Whatever the real divides Wellhausen cut diachronically between Hebrews, Israelites, and Jews or synchronically between institutions, he did not make those gaps unbridgeable or inexplicable through historical coherence.

What drove this movement of conditionality from a trot into a gallop, for this national historian, was the fate of political structures. As he plotted his ancient history of Israel and Judaism, a vacuum in administrative leadership on the level of state was filled by a hieratic apparatus. "The weaker the state grew, the deeper it sank from the fall of Josiah onwards," he contended, "the higher became the prestige of the [Jerusalem] temple in the eyes of the people, and the greater and the more independent grew the power of its numerous priesthood."[155] In fact, priests snatched victory from the jaws of defeat: "So closely was the cultus of Jerusalem interwoven with the consciousness of the Jewish people, and so strongly had the priesthood established their order, that after the collapse of the kingdom the elements still survived here for the formation of a 'congregation' answering to the circumstances and needs of the time."[156] From this perspective, the absence of political autonomy and dependence on foreign hegemony exacerbated such an overrun of clerics and with them an imposition of formalism together with invasiveness of religious institutions. Wellhausen maintained the two rounds of deportations – first by the Assyrians, later the Babylonians – "no doubt helped … to familiarise the Jewish mind with the idea that the covenant depended on conditions, and might possibly be dissolved."[157] When Wellhausen visualized the outcome of this momentous fall, he saw a people detached from their land and therefore a religious imagination disconnected from the rhythm of nature, sundered from the duties of state, and dissociated from political realities. The clerical class proceeded to separate spheres sacred and profane and, in doing so, severed the people from their god, spawning a near obsession with holiness independent of earthly affairs and even independent of the deity himself. However, if he assumed a certain correlation between prophecy and law, then this uncoupling predictably bore consequences for prophetic thought as well. "In earlier times the national state as it had existed under David was the goal of all wishes," he maintained. "Now a universal world empire was erected in imagination, which was to lift up its head at Jerusalem over the ruins of the heathen powers. Prophecy was

[154] Wellhausen, "Israel," 485.
[155] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 420.
[156] Ibid., 421.
[157] Ibid., 419.

no longer tied to history, nor supported by it."[158] From the ashes of the state rose flights of religious fancy.

Wellhausen conceptualized this lot in the nation's history as the political soil in which that plant – or perhaps more accurately that weed – of the "Mosaic theocracy" flourished. In the role of head gardener he cast Ezekiel. Explicitly confirming Jacques Orth's characterization of this exilic prophet as "the key to the Old Testament," Wellhausen considered Ezekiel "the connecting link between the prophets and the law" and thereby the transition figure between Israel and Judaism.[159] "He is by nature a priest," the historian wrote, "and his peculiar merit is that he enclosed the soul of prophecy in the body of a community which was not political, but founded on the temple and the cultus."[160] With this declaration Wellhausen then came to his conclusion: "Thus arose that artificial product, the sacred constitution of Judaism."[161] He pictured a people now deprived of their political sovereignty, dispossessed of their claim to territory, and divested of their national identity, having even lost their language as Aramaic began to dominate. Absent requisite ambition, let alone the power to secure it, this onetime nation-state ultimately withdrew from the harsh reality of international empires and not only sought refuge in fantastical – if not fanatical – dreams of a far-off future but also rewrote a still more ancient past in accord with these ideals. The Israelites thus turned into the Jews, no longer an integral people bound to their land and god or led by an able statesman but a dominated community subject to the passions of sacred specialists. Priests became the rulers; religious law, their scepter. Accordingly, he equated the "Mosaic theocracy" with "the post-exilic hierocracy," claiming, in no uncertain terms, "Theocracy as a constitution is hierocracy."[162] Wellhausen himself explained the development as the direct consequence of a faltered national-political autonomy:

---

[158] Ibid. Consequently, he considered "the church of the second temple, the Jewish hierocracy," possible only under foreign domination and asseverated – as pedantically as it was telling of his own criteria – "anyone who knows anything about history" could see the Mosaic theocracy as "a perfect fit for post-exilian Judaism" and therefore recognize "its actuality only there" (ibid., 150–51; cf., inter alia, ibid., 255–56; idem, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 93). The fulcrum was "*the written Torah*" (idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 410, italics original).

[159] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 421; cf. Orth, "La tribu de Lévi et la Loi," 395. Perhaps worth mentioning, with editor Dillmann Wellhausen reconsidered his review of Duhm's *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion*: "On p. 157 I should have emphasized there was in the earliest period still no difference between priest and prophet" (Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 20, 1876, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 34); the passage in question concerned Ezekiel and the changeover from prophecy to law.

[160] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 421.

[161] Ibid., cf. esp. 422–25.

[162] Ibid., 421. In like manner, he declared, "With it [sc. the cultus] the theocracy begins, and it with the theocracy; the latter is nothing more than the institution for the purpose of carrying on the cultus after the manner ordained by God" (ibid., 53); see further Dörrfuss, *Mose in den Chronikbüchern*, esp. 64–76.

The Mosaic theocracy, the residuum of a ruined state, is itself not a state at all, but an unpolitical artificial product created in spite of unfavourable circumstances by the impulse of an ever-memorable energy: and foreign rule is its necessary counterpart. In its nature it is intimately allied to the old Catholic church, which was in fact its child.[163]

The terminological formulations that the philologist submitted – first of theocracy itself as a correlation of the nation and its god and then of Mosaic theocracy as hierocracy – further warranted Wellhausen's designation of the Jewish community as a "church." As "objectionable" as it might have been to employ an otherwise Christian term to Judaism, he deemed the descriptor apt for the phenomenon (and a far less muddled one at that than the problematic "theocracy") insofar as he had specified a church always presupposed a state.[164] If this past master of antiquity insisted both the early Jewish and the primitive Christian communities had constituted churches on account of each's dependency upon a state already in existence – and a foreign one to boot, either Persia or Rome – he qualified the term's applicability to later Christian history, as the precise relationship between state and (Christian) church ultimately changed.[165]

Intrigued by the interrelations between the nation and the state, between a people and their religion, Wellhausen extended his investigation of the later theocracy – namely, the church – into Second Temple Judaism as well as Christian origins, which furnished a variety of constellations given the Persian, Greek, and Roman empires involved. Although he analyzed this period of Jewish history more broadly in his essay "Israel" and larger volume *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, rumination on the subject had already appeared in *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte*, of 1874.[166]

---

[163] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 422; cf., inter alia, ibid., 150.

[164] Cf. ibid., 422; idem, "Israel," 512.

[165] In his own words, "The original meaning of the Church thus disappeared when it no longer stood over against the heathen world-power, it having become possible for the Christians also to possess a natural fatherland in the nation. In this way it became much more difficult to define accurately the spheres of the state and the Church respectively, regarding the Church as an organisation, not as an invisible community of the faithful" (Wellhausen, "Israel," 512).

[166] As he clarified in the foreword, the book actually had its roots in lectures on Jewish history held in 1871–72, rather than his own, more independent research. For the most thorough exploration of this volume, to which this description is indebted, see Deines, *Die Pharisäer*, 40–67; cf. also Hans-Günther Waubke, *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 196–225. Wellhausen also considered the topic in an edition he completed of an Arabic version of Josippon: Wellhausen, *Der arabische Josippus*, esp. 42–50; cf. also idem, "Ueber den geschichtlichen Wert des zweiten Makkabäerbuchs, im Verhältnis zum ersten," in Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der Königl[ichen] Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1905* (Göttingen: Dieterich [Horstmann], 1905), 117–63. Momigliano opines, "Wellhausen knew the Books on the Maccabees and Flavius Josephus better than anybody else. Even now his account of the political situation in Judaea under Greeks and Romans has few rivals, but he had difficulties in correlating political and religious development" (idem, "Religious History Without Frontiers," 54).

In fact, he had even employed the language of hierocracy and theocracy alike, albeit contrasting the "first," "old" theocracy against the "new," "second" one.[167] First, the philologist delineated rival factions in the Second Temple period. In doing so, he detected not a schism owing to "the few insignificant juridical and theological differences" but rather "the opposition of a predominantly political [party] against a predominantly religious party in a more spiritual than worldly community" – forces also set in foil as "the opposition of the churchly party, the genuine representatives of the community of the Second Temple, over against the worldly political one" and, still further, "not churchly against churchly, not political against political, but churchly against political."[168] Second, Wellhausen judged the Pharisees the more important party, whom he considered "the Jews in the superlative, the true Israel," and granted greater attention accordingly.[169] He found their roots in the same (Jewish) tradition lurking beyond the biblical texts. Having cast the Pharisees as heirs to the so-called scribes, he asserted the scribes themselves had traced their own heritage back to the prophetic priests of an earlier age, the ilk of Ezekiel and Ezra, who had founded a new Jewish theocracy on the rubble of a fallen kingdom. The scribes thus served as a bridge for Jewish history. These "representatives of the law" hence bequeathed to the Pharisees a commitment to religious rule. Just as "the rule (*Herrschaft*) of the law was the goal of the scribes, [and] their own rule over the community was the result," so also their inheritors knew "only a single task, that of fulfilling the law. This is the lone purpose of their work."[170] Thirdly, through these internal Jewish dynamics he examined the fuller consequences of said Mosaic theocracy, i. e., a people and religion sans a state. The implications of religious politics, or political religion, then came into view. In the wake of the Maccabean Revolt, the Pharisees, so Wellhausen, had risen in opposition to the Hasmonean Dynasty – a political entity they considered contrary to "the spiritual constitution of Ezra."[171] The Sadducees were therefore "the representatives of the new state, which grew out of the Maccabean uprising"; the Pharisees, "those of the community, whose foundation and purpose was the Torah."[172] In the end, the Pharisees prevailed. Just as a previous epoch had ultimately preserved the worship of Yahweh by transforming a national god into a universal deity and reconceptualizing a relationship determined by conditions, so too this group countered a national movement and further divested Judaism of political ambitions. "The Pharisees deserve the merit of having demolished the Hasmonean state and having saved Judaism,"

[167] See further Dörrfuss, *Mose in den Chronikbüchern*, 72–73.
[168] Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 56, 119–20, 94.
[169] Ibid., 17.
[170] Ibid., 15, 21
[171] Ibid., 92.
[172] Ibid., 94–95.

he declared.[173] In his final estimation, the Jewish community had lost its national and political qualities, a religious sect concerned solely with a transcendent god and immanent law.[174]

If Wellhausen visualized the loss of national-political autonomy as the wedge between ancient Israel and early Judaism, he also imagined a substantial separation between said Judaism and formative Christianity – or, more properly, "the gospel." The historian did not deny the Christian roots of Judaism, but he traced much thicker, longer ones back to Israel instead. In his later work on the New Testament texts, the philologist contended that Jesus had suffered beneath the yoke of "a murderous tradition" (*einer ertötenden Tradition*) and hence opposed not the Romans but rather the Jewish priests and scribes, adding in a subsequent edition explicit reference to "the yoke of hierocracy and nomocracy."[175] The same conviction had arisen even earlier. Perhaps most explicitly in a passage titled "Judaism and Christianity" – which shifted places structurally throughout the reprints of his article "Israel" and corresponded to a chapter entitled "The Gospel" in his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, itself an object of positional change across that book's editions – Wellhausen articulated this realignment of the past, a break between the ancient Hebrew people and the later Jewish religion and a bond between Christianity and the Hebrew scriptures.[176] Whereas Judaism, he argued, "is full of new impulses, and has an entirely different physiognomy from that of Hebrew antiquity, so much so that it is hard even to catch a likeness," "[t]he Gospel develops hidden impulses of the Old Testament, but it is a protest against the ruling tendency of Judaism."[177] However, this ruling tendency not only oppressed the true religion of the Hebrew Bible but also suppressed a knowledge of that nascent religion. Wellhausen determined some elements within the

[173] Ibid., 95. As Susannah Heschel observes, this conclusion proves "a dubious honor, given Wellhausen's judgment of Judaism" (Heschel, "The German Theological Tradition," in *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007], 353–73, at 365; also idem, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus* [Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998], 211).

[174] Wellhausen further remarked, "Since the exile, the Jews were hardly a nation any more, rather a sect scattered over the entire word, which was held together primarily by religion and only secondarily by blood, which at that would never in itself have been sufficient as a bonding agent had it not also entailed religious value" (idem, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 95).

[175] Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1st ed (Berlin: Reimer, 1905), 93; 2nd ed (Berlin: Reimer, 1911), 83; cf also idem, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 112.

[176] With the third edition of his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, Wellhausen moved the chapter on the gospel to the other side of that on the fall of the Jewish community, which meant his history of Israelite and Jewish history then culminated in the rise of early Christianity. In the sixth, he added a note to the chapter, which stated he now only agreed with it in part. In fact, his lack of full satisfaction found expression already with the first edition: responding to the publisher's inquiry about a publication of this chapter as a separate pamphlet, the author indicated he wanted to avoid a wide dissemination given such discontentment (Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, [November 8 or 9, 1894,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 324, cf. 715 n. 1).

[177] Wellhausen, "Israel," 508, 509.

New Testament "so thoroughly saturated with the Jewish ideas of the disciples" that access to Jesus' own teaching was obstructed.[178] Here again, he told the story of corruption by epigoni, of both religion and tradition. The orientalist attributed the institution of a church – as per his own definition – not to Jesus the inspired individual but the Jews as an apolitical sect. "The Church is not His work," he insisted, "but an inheritance from Judaism to Christianity."[179] He elaborated:

> Under the Persian domination the Jews built up an unpolitical community on the basis of religion. The Christians found themselves in a position with regard to the Roman Empire precisely similar to that which the Jews had occupied with regard to the Persian; and so they also founded, after the Jewish pattern, in the midst of the state which was foreign and hostile to them, and in which they could not feel themselves at home, a religious community as their true fatherland.[180]

Yet Jesus had shown the way beyond theocracy in both its manifestations – as a borderline amoral particularism or a disconnected priestly apparatus. This ancient Jewish prophet seemed fitting indeed for the modern German Empire. In Wellhausen's account, Jesus neither kindled nationalist sentiment, nor did he promote a statist intervention when developing "those hidden impulses of the Old Testament" embedded in the history of Judaism. His work was not the church but rather the individualization of religion, the liberation from institutions, the cultivation of self-sacrifice, the dissemination of morality, and the limitation of emotion – bourgeois values upheld by the historian himself.[181]

2.5 Formative Islam: A Narrative Retold

In 1882, the year before the hebraist issued his second edition of *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, and a good decade prior to publishing his follow-up volume *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, Wellhausen printed *Muhammed in Medina*. At the very start of the work, the semitist plainly stated, "I have made the transition from the Old Testament to the Arabs with the intent of coming to know the wildling onto which the scion of the Torah of Yahweh was grafted by priests and prophets."[182] He continued, "I have no doubt that an idea of those primordial

[178] Ibid., 512.

[179] Ibid.

[180] Ibid. So, too, he wrote, "In this way the spiritualisation of the worship is seen in the Priestly Code as advancing *pari passu* with its centralisation. It receives, so to speak, an *abstract* religious character; it separates itself in the first instance from daily life, and then absorbs the latter by becoming, strictly speaking, its proper business. The consequences for the future were momentous. The Mosaic 'congregation' is the mother of the Christian church; the Jews were the creators of that idea" (idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 81).

[181] Cf. Wellhausen, "Israel," 509–13.

[182] Wellhausen, *Muhammed in Medina*, 5. When *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* as well as the articles "Moses" and Moab," for *Encyclopædia Britannica*, did appear the following year,

features with which the Hebrews entered history will most likely be won through comparison with Arab antiquity." With the sense of "history" here suggesting written records, the philologist set forth a now familiar problem: the distortion by a later tradition of a still more ancient past.[183] The same as Hebrews or Israelites, whose past had undergone manipulation by later Jewish historiographers, he described any sight caught of these Arabs as preserved and yet obstructed by subsequent Islam. To regain this distant history embedded in the literature, the historian proposed an investigation of Arab antiquities in juxtaposition with that religion which had claimed their past. Indeed, the very title of his series *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* betrayed this perceived affinity, which he initially proposed as "Contributions to Research on the History and Literature of the Hebrews and the Arabs" and "Sketches and Spadework on the History of the Hebrews and Arabs."[184] If Wellhausen examined the histories of ancient Israel, emergent Judaism, and nascent Christianity on account of genealogy – the continuity of their pasts – he now scrutinized formative Islam owing to a different logic. Notwithstanding the ancestry of Islam in Jewish and Christian communities, his interpretive operations mostly followed the premises first of semiticity and primitivity and then of analogy.

Though oft deployed in tandem, two distinguishable lines of argumentation underwrote his comparison of Israelites and Arabs.[185] The first proceeded on the basis of genetics. As with ethnic heritage or linguistic lineage – so the logic went – these two peoples *qua* Semites preserved a common ancestry of customs, values, and practices, inclusive of religion, even if they gradually parted ways over the passage of time, as each underwent its own course of evolution.[186] A second

---

they did so along with an essay on formative Islam, also written for the encyclopedia: Julius Wellhausen, "Mohammedanism, Part 1: Mohammed and the First Four Caliphs," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., Vol. 16 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), 545–65.

[183] Wellhausen, *Muhammed in Medina,* 5; see also, e. g., idem, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 141; cf. his original, slightly different statement in the work's first edition, idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 3, *Reste arabischen Heidentumes*, 164–65.

[184] So *Vorarbeiten und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Hebräer und der Araber* (cf. Wellhausen to Reimer, February 4, 1884, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 140–41); *Beiträge zur Erforschung der Geschichte und Literatur der Hebraeer und Araber* (cf. Wellhausen to Smith, February 6, 1883, in ibid., 117–18). In a similar fashion, he wrote Michael Jan de Goeje (1836–1909), "To be precise, it is not exactly the events that are attractive to me but rather the things that remain constant in custom, law, and point of view, that is, the so-called antiquities. For essentially I am chasing after the phantom of semitism, and that is the band that holds these studies together with my earlier ones" (Wellhausen to de Goeje, December 20, 1879, in ibid., 64–65).

[185] Cf. pp. 268–72 below. Further reflection on this near equation between Arabs and Israelites throughout Wellhausen's corpus as well as on the analytical leverage he sought to gain from such comparison requires a modification of the position adopted in Paul Michael Kurtz, "Axes of Inquiry: The Problem of Form and Time in Wellhausen and Gunkel," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 29, no. 2 (2015): 247–95, at 267–68.

[186] For an instance of Wellhausen approaching questions of historical and social linguistics, cf. Julius Wellhausen, review of *Die semitischen Sprachen. Eine Skizze*, by Theodor Nöldeke, *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 8, no. 27 (1887): 966–68.

principle, by contrast, followed more general understandings of anthropology, which ordered societies (ancient and modern alike) according to fixed stages of development and thus allowed a collation of different peoples independent of origins. (Additionally, though far less often, Wellhausen did account for cultural similarities through geographic proximity, as when he discussed circumcision among not only Hebrews and Arabs but also East Africans or at least Egyptians.[187]) In consequence, the semitist could consolidate sets of data beneath the greater class of Semitic as well as that of primitive and move with little limitation across the boundaries in between, as when he inquired into "Arab-Israelite" law or adduced evidence from the Hebrews in his discussion of marriage among the Arabs.[188] These two arguments together also gave him the grounds that underlay his suspicion of the promises showed by assyriology.[189] The orientalist appended to one review a brief statement on how the study of "heathenism" provided surer footing for the inquiry into the history of Semitic religion than that afforded by newly unearthed material from Babylonia or Assyria, asserting the former ought to act as a control for the latter.[190] As Rogerson has phrased the discrepancy, "… it was not that they [i. e., those who concentrated on Arabic material] 'ignored' the

[187] Cf. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 3, *Reste arabischen Heidentumes*, 1st ed., 168.

[188] Cf. Wellhausen, "Arabisch-israelitisch," in *Zum ältesten Strafrecht der Kulturvölker*, ed. Mommsen; idem, "Die Ehe bei den Arabern." For a contemporaneous discussion of such comparative venues, cf. Ernst Tröltsch (*sic*), "Religionsphilosophie," in *Die Philosophie im Beginn des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Festschrift für Kuno Fischer,* ed. Wilhelm Windelband, 2nd ed. (Heidelberg: Winter, 1907), 423–86, at 454–66. On the deeper assumptions of anthropology at work in such operations: see Andrew Zimmerman's *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 38–61.

[189] Hoping to prove the scholar not one behind his times, celebrants of Wellhausen oft defend if not Wellhausen's competence in then at least his familiarity with cuneiform research by invoking his essay "Ueber den bisherigen Gang und den gegenwärtigen Stand der Keilentzifferung," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, n.s. 31 (1876): 153–75. Other evidence of such awareness lies at the ready: see, inter alia, Julius Wellhausen, "Die Zeitrechnung des Buchs der Könige seit der Theilung des Reichs," *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 20 (1875): 607–40 [cf. the editors, "Berichtigung," *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 21 (1876): 151]; idem, review of *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, by George Smith, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1, no. 21 (1876): 539–41; idem, review of *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Orients. Die Assyriologie in Deutschland*, by Alfred von Gutschmid, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1, no. 21 (1876): 534–38; idem, review of *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung. Ein Beitrag zur monumentalen Geographie, Geschichte und Chronologie der Assyrer*, by Eberhard Schrader, *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 29, no. 52 (1878): 1691–93. On his judgment of such material, his opinion of scholarship on it, and his reasons for not pursuing this field professionally, see first and foremost Machinist, "The Road Not Taken"; cf. also, inter alia, Shavit and Eran, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn*, esp. 102 n. 289. See, too, p. 127, n. 16 below.

[190] Julius Wellhausen, review of *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Vol. 1, by Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 139, no. 6 (1877): 185–92, at 192; cf. also idem, review of *Studien in arabischen Dichtern*, Vol. 4, *Altarabische Parallelen zum Alten Testament zusammengestellt,* by Georg Jacob, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 22, no. 19 (1897): 505; but cp. idem, review of *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Vol. 2, by Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 141, no. 4 (1879): 106–11, at 109–10.

new discoveries. On the contrary, for them, the new discoveries were irrelevant. They might indeed be *ancient*, but they were certainly not *primitive*."[191] If somewhat overstated, this description still suggests the epistemological differences in the choice of comparative data.

Inasmuch as Wellhausen assumed an almost fated correspondence between the pre-Islamic Arabs and the ancient Israelites by virtue of their common heredity and elementarity – which then served as his warrant to transcend languages and lands, epochs and ethnicities – certain similarities in his portrayal of each should come as no surprise. Yet on a different level, he simply saw similitude in the sequence of events. As Momigliano writes,

> More precisely what Wellhausen liked in the Israel of old was the coexistence with the adventurers themselves of rude harsh prophets who tried to teach morality to a nation of adventurers who enjoyed life, conquered territories, built up harems, and passed into history under the respected names of Saul, Solomon, Achab, and maybe David. What moved Wellhausen toward Arab history … was the feeling that he would find there again what he had liked in old Israel.[192]

Wellhausen thus observed a commonality of pasts. These rougher (more masculine) times together with those protagonists of old who featured so prominently in them exerted an especial pull upon him. More than out of some mere personal appeal, the subject of formative Islam appeared to promise purchase for his analytical interests. Albert Hourani has called attention to the forces operating in Wellhausen's history of Israel that also emerged in his study of the Arab tribes:

---

[191] John W. Rogerson, *Anthropology and the Old Testament*, repr. ed. (The Biblical Seminar; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 30, italics original. Rogerson elaborates: "The ancient Babylonian civilization was syncretistic; it was built on Sumerian (i. e. non-Semitic) foundations, and it had been contaminated by many non-Semitic influences. The Arabic sources, whether literary, or those investigated by Curtiss, might be much later than the Babylonian texts, but they were 'purer', and therefore a better source for reconstructing primitive Semitic religion" (ibid.).

[192] Momigliano, "Religious History Without Frontiers," 53. In this thrilling passage, the author goes on to say, "And indeed he found the conflict between the austerity of the Bedouins and the lust of the city dwellers, and within the Bedouins the mysterious coexistence of the prophet and the warrior. […] Wellhausen enormously admired the early Ummayads (*sic*) who were capable of turning the Bedouins 'zu räsonablen Staatsbürgern.' By the same token, he was full of sympathy for the half-Arab Herod the Great of Judaea who almost managed to turn the Jews into reasonable citizens. But this for Wellhausen was only one aspect of Islamic history. The other aspect equally claimed his sympathy – the side, say, of the Charijites who opposed what Wellhausen called the 'schlechte Katholizität' of official Islam and remained intolerant, utopistic, and unable to accept the dynastic principle. Some of Wellhausen's most forceful pages are those of his description of Bedouin morality. Later he was to declare sympathy for the Boers of South Africa, notwithstanding his recognition of the advantages of Pax Britannica. He liked prophets and rebels; what he did not like was the triumph of rabbis and priests, the elimination of contrasts between worldly politicians and religious warriors. Above all he did not like, whether in Judaism or early Christianity or modern Germany, the respectability of theologians in control" (ibid.).

The state, prophecy, and the law: these three elements are to be found in Islam too, although the relation between them is of course not quite the same. The state was founded after the prophet had preached, but before the content of prophecy was fully articulated; the law came later and here too perhaps it destroyed religious freedom. Thus a study of Islam could help to illuminate the general nature of religion; but it is typical of the age in which Wellhausen lived, of its belief in the metaphysical importance of the state and in the nation-state as its highest form, that his special attention should have been given to one of the three elements, the Arabian nation-state.[193]

Instead of Semitic ethnography or primitive sociology, analogy supplied this rationale. Parallel past developments permitted Wellhausen, in consequence, to elucidate each history with the other – although these peoples' shared genetics and mutual stage of progressive advancement further bolstered the endeavor. The venture of comparing and contrasting therefore allowed him to illumine the formation of national consciousness, the foundation of the state, the innovation of morality, and the institution of law in both directions. Like the prevailing problem of sources as perceived by him and the methodological solution he invariably endorsed, so too the object of inquiry transcended his specific object of research.

The philologist surveyed texts and measured the history of tradition, but the historian also uncovered a prehistoric age buried in that selfsame literature. If he dug into ancient writings in hopes of accessing a still more distant past – namely, the rudiments of the nation-state – at the very bedrock of this primitive Semitic society Wellhausen found religion. He came closest to the elementary forms of religious life with his *Reste arabischen Heidentumes* – especially in the section "Things Religio-Historical" – first published in issue three of his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* ("Sketches and Spadework") and reworked as a separate volume precisely ten years later.[194] The Israelite and Arabian tribes presented him with a prospect of primitive society among these nomadic and semi-nomadic peoples, including the earliest stages of national formation and even religion itself. If he did draw some distinction between the two along the way, his reconstructions of (or speculations on) Semitic society were more alike than not.

Wellhausen explored the very essence of heathendom.[195] However brief or cursory, his assessment of tribal culture entailed a crucial correlation of deities and devotees, yet he went back even further: to the origin of the gods and social

[193] Albert Hourani, "Islam and the Philosophers of History," *Middle Eastern Studies* 3, no. 3 (1967): 206–68, at 240.

[194] See Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 3, *Reste arabischen Heidentumes*; 2nd ed., *Reste arabischen Heidentums*. In the section titled "God, The World, and the Life of Men in Old Israel" – a component of his article "Israel" and chapter in *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* – Wellhausen painted an especially vivid portrait of this olden world as well; cf., too, "Die Anfänge des Volkes," in Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*; "Das Anfangsstadium der Volks- und Religionsgeschichte," in idem, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion."

[195] On Wellhausen's reconstruction of such development in religion, see further Hawting, *The Idea of Idolatry and the Emergence of Islam*, 26–33; Rudolph, "Wellhausen as an Arabist," esp. 128–29.

groups themselves. Earthly spirits initially tied to nature eventually turned into heavenly divinities, which became bound to their adherents by means of cultic practice. (Rejecting the theory of some instinct for monotheism inherent among the Semitic peoples, he considered "sexual dualism" the most important feature for their common conception of divinity, a pairing of male and female deities.[196]) Wellhausen believed a sanguineous connection of deity and votary emerged through cultic sacrifice: the blood included in oblations united the god to its adherents. However, blood also bonded the community itself: as various venerators coalesced around a god, they saw themselves as kin. This perceived (if not actual) "natural" relation of consanguinity then legitimized the group – the sanctity of blood effecting a sense of sacrality for the community itself. The historian therefore spoke of tribal groups as cultic ones and referred to cult as the first religion. Moreover, the god, just like the collective, changed in the course of time. As the union strengthened between the divine and human beings, the one between the god and his original, naturalistic features weakened, with the divinity assuming, in consequence, celestial attributes instead, though not undergoing (or rather returning to) any actual identification with those cosmic bodies themselves. Approaching then fashionable questions of totemism, Wellhausen asserted the name assigned to a given deity had combined with its apprehension, as the community's own patron prompted an association of worshippee and worshippers on the basis of ethnicity. First effected by blood, this fusion of adherents – not only to their deity but also amongst themselves – intensified into a still deeper integration by means of further religious practice. As social organization developed into higher forms of complexity, he argued, a different sort of adhesive then replaced the bond of blood: namely, the "religious idea of its [sc. the community's] sacrality."[197] Accordingly, a qualitative change in the conceptualized relationship correlated to a quantitative one in the community itself. The roots of Semitic society were nourished by the waters – or the lifeblood – of religion.

He argued forcefully for a radical correlation between a people and their god. From this "ethnicism of the cult religion," whereby a group of venerators became locked around their deity, came the notion of polytheism: *quot gentes tot dii* ("so many nations, as many gods").[198] As he narrated the phases of religious history, the ethnic dimension implied in said cult religion did not persist unchanged: polytheism thus gave way to syncretism. In terms of mechanism, Wellhausen reasoned both trade and pilgrimage caused a mingling of peoples and their cults in consequence. This exchange of goods brought with it an interchange of ideas. Polytheistic thinking therefore gradually dissolved – the boundaries of difference between the tribes as well as their respective deities dissipating by dint of con-

[196] Ernest Renan (1823–1892) became a principal proponent of this claim opposed by Wellhausen. On the larger background, see Williamson, *Longing for Myth in Germany*, 223–29.

[197] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 23.

[198] Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 215.

tact with one another – as did the ethnic, particularistic mentality. In this way, a common heritage of language, perspective, and cultural formation (*Bildung*) took shape: the building blocks of a national identity. With respect to the Arab tribes, Wellhausen maintained Allah had eventually encompassed and then surpassed all other deities, whence came his declaration of syncretism as "the transition to monotheism."[199] Further still, the historian distinguished religion from the cult. "At first, the cult is religion," he claimed, "but in the time Islam had emerged, this had not been the case already for some time."[200] So, too, he stated, "With the decline of the cult emerges what we actually understand by [the term] religion, in opposition to the cult …."[201] Wellhausen also asserted some Arabs even had little true attachment to the cult: rather, the Meccans held onto paganism out of sheer economic interest, whereas women and children did so since "they are in general much more superstitious (*abergläubischer*) and think much more of magic and prediction."[202] The rise of monotheistic thought corresponded to social and national history. Nevertheless, religion in its most rudimentary form, amongst Arabs and Israelites alike, betrayed a pagan character, entwined as it was with a life connected to nature, a morality confined to the tribe, and a deity mostly identified with fate.

If Wellhausen visualized a certain kind of religion at the very foundation of these Semitic nations, he also envisioned founders hard at work in building them. The blocks long shaped by syncretism required able builders to construct them properly, not least of all with blueprints drafted in cooperation with a god. Against the background of this pagan past he painted, the semitist portrayed an inspired prophet of great political power. The historian of national religion expressed an admiration of Muhammad for his smithing of the tribes into a people. Wellhausen submitted, "… what he chiefly did was to make a concession to heathenism, and bring about a nationalization of Islam, the purpose of welding together the Arab tribes … into one community."[203] Concerning the process of fusion, Wellhausen believed religion supplied the material: polity ensued from nationality, which had origins of its own in religiosity. As he commenced *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, "The political community of Islam grew out of the religious community" – a statement that clearly echoed an earlier one, concerning another Semitic people: "It was out of the religion of Israel that the commonwealth of Israel unfolded itself …."[204] Yet Wellhausen emphasized the

[199] Ibid., 217.
[200] Ibid., 219, cf. 225.
[201] Ibid., 221.
[202] Ibid., 220.
[203] Wellhausen, "Mohammedanism, Part 1: Mohammed and the First Four Caliphs," 553.
[204] Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 1; idem, "Israel," 436. The historian did not collapse the two entirely. For instance, the god of the Hebrews retained a particularistic, i. e., national, element along with his proper name. Equating religion and patriotism, Wellhausen maintained, "Yahweh the god of Israel and Israel the people of god – this was at all times the

agency. It was thus the prophet who had done the growing. Accordingly, amidst a rampant anarchy among the Arab tribes, Muhammad "established the commonwealth of Medina on the basis of religion as an *Ummat Allah*, a congregation of God."[205] Indeed, the prophet's political exploits won him high praise from the historian. Wellhausen insisted, "The founding of the state upon the feeling of fellowship generated by religion, was without question the Prophet's greatest achievement …."[206] But Wellhausen went even further, proclaiming, "The Koran is Mohammed's weakest performance; the weight of his historical importance lies in his work at Medina and not in that at Mecca."[207] In fact, he even discerned a cynicism in Mohammad's undertakings.[208] Still, the prophet together with his ambitions did not succeed without resistance in the account that Wellhausen told. The arabist described a "great feud between heathendom and Allah which was being fought out between Mecca and Medina" – one that resulted, internally, in "a thorough Arabisation of Islam itself" and a kind of leveling between Islam and "Arabism."[209] Here especially, the historian considered the nature – and entanglement – of things religious, national, and political.

Now, according to Wellhausen's theory of social, religious, and political development, the prophet could never have founded a church even had he so desired, for no state had yet existed – a state being the prerequisite of any church as per his redefinition. Nation and religion preceded state, which necessarily anteceded church. The very concept of political authority otherwise absent among the early Arabs, Allah thus became "the personification of the state supremacy" – an elevation effected by Muhammed.[210] Although Wellhausen believed the concept of a "monarchic prophet" in Islam had come from "the later Jews" – that is, a

---

quintessence of the Israelite religion. With the emergences of this relationship begins the history of Israel" (idem, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 8). Unlike Assyrians, Israelites, and Moabites, by contrast, the Arabs allegedly showed a weaker correspondence of the people and their god: the ties of blood may have knit together families, clans, houses, and tribes, yet the nation as a whole never rallied around religion, which accounted, in part, for their perpetual blood feuds (Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 6–7; cf. idem, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 215).

[205] Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 7, cf. 22–24. I am grateful to Fred Donner and Sean Anthony for kindly sharing their insight into Wellhausen's portrait of Islam.

[206] Wellhausen, "Mohammedanism, Part 1: Mohammed and the First Four Caliphs," 554.

[207] Ibid., 561. Preceding this assertion, he had argued, "By any other instrumentality than that of a prophet it would hardly have been possible to found the state of Medina; religion was the soul of the community. The founding of a religion and the forming of a state were not connected in so merely external a way as is usually supposed; on the contrary, the one was the natural and necessary consequence of the other. This must certainly be conceded, that, if we are to make any distinctions at all, Islam was far less rich in religious meaning than in social forces" (ibid.).

[208] He declared immediately thereafter, "And it is a fact that the politician in him outgrew the prophet more and more, and that in many cases where he assigned spiritual motives he merely did so to give a fair appearance to acts that emanated from secular regards" (ibid.); cf. also, inter alia, idem, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 4–5.

[209] Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 18, 24.

[210] Ibid., 7–8.

commonwealth with the prophet and divine law standing at the top – he distinguished Islamic theocracy from the Jewish "post-exilic hierocracy" by asserting no difference obtained between "religious and secular callings" in the former.[211] Another mark of difference, justice – as opposed to holiness – characterized this conception of the deity, which then warranted his description of theocracy in its Islamic manifestation as "dichaarchy" (i. e., dicaearchy, or rule by law).[212] Wellhausen underscored, however, "There was no law as yet; Islam was in existence before the Qoran (*sic*)."[213] Consequently, "The power of Allah pervaded every function and organ of the state, and the administration of justice and war were just as sacred offices as divine service. The mosque was at one and the same time the forum and the drill-ground; the congregation was also the army; the leader in prayer … was also the commander."[214] If the semitist examined Islam's genealogy in Judaism and detailed convergence and divergence in their histories, he also charted how they parted ways in the end. Wellhausen thus concluded, "… Islam was definitely sundered from Judaism and changed into a national Arab religion."[215] The elements of prophecy, law, nation, and state were all manifest in formative Islam as in ancient Israel, though in a different order and on a different timeline. Both entailed another factor as well: namely, epigones.

As the orientalist reconstructed the history of formative Islam, producing an account that resonated strongly with his others of ancient Judaism and early Christianity, the story of Muhammad's successors became one of disputed interests, religious and political both. Wellhausen's own interest moved not only towards the raw material of nations or even the consolidators of such consciousness but also toward immediate successors and the early traditions of origins, including transmission, adaptation, and exploitation. So, too, he launched an inquiry into those who had come after the founder in Islam. Asserting, "… out of the national state which Muhammad had founded there arose after his death a kingdom, a rule of the theocracy over the world," the arabist proceeded to narrate the early history of Islam without the prophet.[216] As Hawting has summarized, Wellhausen "stressed the rivalries which developed among the leading circle of Muslims in Medina, between the Meccans and Medinese among the Muslim

[211] Ibid., 9–10. On Wellhausen's conception of theocracy within Islamic history, see Dörrfuss, *Mose in den Chronikbüchern*, 74–75.

[212] In a different venue, he offered a critique of this construction: "For his time, he [sc. Muhammad] set the world on fire; the mistake was only that it was supposed to be in effect for all time. That is the mistake of the theocracy; it fails to see that the organization of the community cannot be anything divine and eternal but must meet changing human needs" (Julius Wellhausen, review of *Ueber die Blutrache bei den vorislamischen Arabern und Mohammeds Stellung zu ihr*, by Otto Procksch, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 25, no. 13 [1900]: 385).

[213] Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 9.

[214] Ibid., 10, cf. also 15–17.

[215] Ibid., 20.

[216] Ibid., 24.

elite, and between the more pious early Muslims and the later, opportunist converts like most of the Umayyads."[217]

In the process, this historian of antiquity displayed a keen sensitivity to factors of contingency at work amidst the conflicts between groups. One dispute related to the transference of authority. Since neither the "old-Arab tradition" nor the "idea of the theocracy" ostensibly contained any "practical science of government," the question of succession to Muhammed led to a sharp cleavage between parties.[218] To preserve their position of power, he argued, Muhammad's inner circle deployed religious means to political ends, legitimizing their rule as guardians of tradition, i. e., the Quran and Sunna.[219] Judging the murder of Uthman "more epoch-making than almost any other event of Islamic history," Wellhausen explored the struggles between oppositional forces over the future of Islam.[220] Such internal competition first set "the genuine theocratic nobility which had its roots in Islam" against "an old heathen noble family which had headed the Quraish in the struggle against Islam," which entailed a geographical dimension and thus gave rise to an external antagonism between the capital and the provinces. This conflict largely featured in the figure of Ali and, through the fate of rival Uthman, desecrated "the sanctity of the Khalifate" – thereby transforming its subsequent control to a matter of force.[221] As the historian advanced his narrative through the early history of Islam, he granted special attention to these interactions between religious and political ambitions. The Umayyads, for example, represented little more than usurpers and unreligious pretenders, who had promoted the interests of state through the discourse of Islam, yet Wellhausen still admired their statecraft.[222] However, he had few words of praise for the religious leaders of the extreme conservative variety, who had arisen in opposition but, in the end, proved no less manipulative in their operations. Thus, the semitist described their rise "in the same way as the Judaean Scribes and Pharisees opposed the Hasmoneans."[223] Concerning the "most thorough-going representatives of the theocratic opposition," namely, the Kharijites, Wellhausen wrote, "They strove most openly and decisively for the Kingdom of God, and also most fiercely for a pitiless Utopia."[224] In addition to matters of hierarchy, geography, and religiosity, he addressed the ethnological aspects of such strife as well. Eventually, the Islamic theocracy became a specifically Arab state, which

[217] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam*, 25.
[218] Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 33.
[219] Ibid., 35, 45–46, cf. 62–63.
[220] Ibid., 50.
[221] Ibid., 42, 54.
[222] Ibid., 60–63.
[223] Ibid., 62–63; cf. 307–10, 498–99.
[224] Ibid., 63, 65. In his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, Wellhausen likened them to the Zealots, Maccabeans, and Puritans (*ad loc*., 331).

conflicted, however, with the original conception of theocracy.[225] Wellhausen depicted the Abbasids as ushering in a "new era" in the history of Islam – one "essentially distinguishable from the old by its relation to the religion" – but even so, he saw the same use (and abuse) of religion in the service of rule: they, too, were "only making Islam serve their own ends."[226] Accordingly, the Abbasids may have shifted the locus of governance from nationality to religion, but "[i]n spite of apparently being opposite, they in this respect took the same course as the Umaiyids (*sic*), only they stood far more emphatically than the latter for Catholicism, and followed far more decidedly the deviating ways which endangered religious and political unity."[227] In consequence, the orientalist composed his history of ancient Islam by tracing the contours of a larger historical landscape and focusing on religio-political factions, as he had already done, for instance, with his earlier work on the Pharisees and Sadducees. With the category of theocracy – however redefined – Wellhausen found leverage to uncover contentious transformations not only in the past of Israel or Judaism but also in that of Islam.

As Wellhausen began his professional career, the world surrounding him was undergoing most drastic change. From that ambitious endeavor of a German unification to the bitter struggles of the *Kulturkampf*, he himself was witness to contested boundaries of multiplex temporal and spiritual powers.[228] The philologist scrutinized discordance in texts, and in them he saw discord between parties, of natures both religious and political. In the historiography he wrote, Wellhausen presented ancient pasts in which political leaders clashed and collaborated with religious ones. Not infrequently, he considered how the presence of mighty leaders integrated nations and how their absence enabled priests and foreign powers to dominate the state. In this way, among others, the present made its way into the past. Thus, Ran HaCohen has observed,

> If we apply Wellhausen's methodological principle to his own writings – that is, that texts testify to the period in which they were written more than to the period they describe – one can hardly avoid the impression that Wellhausen ultimately saw in ancient Israel a reflection of the Prussian kingdom – the enlightened Protestant monarchy – and in Judaism a reflection of all that was opposed to it.[229]

---

[225] Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 68–73.

[226] Ibid., 562, 563, cf. 556.

[227] Ibid., 564.

[228] On the confluence of developments that ultimately led to this struggle, see Gross, *The War Against Catholicism*.

[229] HaCohen, *Reclaiming the Hebrew Bible*, 132. Similarly, another commentator writes, "The attachment of Christianity onto the height of the history of ancient Israel occurred not in the foundation of the church but in the German nation-state of cultural-Protestant character. This [latter], and not the church – be it Catholic or Protestant – realizes the model of the 'ideal theocracy.' Against the backdrop of Wellhausen's historiography, the German Reich under the founding figures of Bismarck and Wilhelm I appears as a likeness of the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom (*Reiches*)" (Michael Konkel, "'Die Theokratie als Idee und als Anstalt': Geschichte Isra-

Like that deeper ancient past of coalescing constituents, cohering national consciousness, and emerging institutions of a people's state, the topic of Jews' relationship to a surrounding political world of ancient empires surely echoed with contemporary questions of Jewish emancipation, assimilation, identity, and belonging in the larger European theatre of anti-Judaism.[230] So, too, the specter of the global Catholic Church in a new-found, mostly Protestant national empire and the renegotiations of rights and responsibilities between ecclesiastical and civil authorities left their mark on his historiography. As Wellhausen sought to reconstruct the past of Israel, he had in mind the history of not only an ancient, primitive nation but also a Semitic one. The historian deployed technologies of philological science to straighten the tangled composition of texts into a linear account of development over time. All the while, however, larger themes of nation, state, and religion emerged.

When Wellhausen examined the pasts of ancient Christianity and Judaism, he considered the political dimensions of religious communities more broadly, discussing the variable relationships between a church and state. He described their purviews overlapping and yet shifting in antiquity. These reflections then drove him to deliberate over the present. The one-time theologian averred, "Now we must acknowledge that the nation is more certainly created by God than the Church, and that God works more powerfully in the history of the nations than

---

els und Judentum in der protestantischen Exegese des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Die Konstruktion des Jüdischen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, ed. Michael Konkel, Alexandra Pontzen, and Henning Theißen [Studien zu Judentum und Christentum; Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003], 69–85, at 81–82). An inquiry into Wellhausen's portrayal of "reformation" and "counter-reformation" in ancient Israel could benefit from this line of analysis, too: cf., e. g., Wellhausen, "Israel," 485–86.

[230] The place of antisemitism in the work of Wellhausen has undergone much scrutiny. Such discussion came already in his lifetime, as when, for instance, Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch (1851–1923) declared, in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, "Although his works are monuments of marvelous scholarship, they may be said to be marred by an unmistakable anti-Jewish bias and a consequent ignoring of the labors of Jewish writers" (Hirsch, "Wellhausen, Julius," in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, ed. Isidore Singer, Vol. 12, *Talmud–Zweifel* [New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1906], 501). The debate may have reached its height in the 1980s: see, e. g., Rolf Rendtorff, "Die jüdische Bibel und ihre antijüdische Auslegung," in *Auschwitz – Krise der christlichen Theologie. Eine Vortragsreihe*, ed. idem and Ekkehard Stegemann (Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog 10; Munich: Kaiser, 1980), 99–116; Rudolf Smend, "Wellhausen und das Judentum," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 79, no. 3 (1982): 249–82 [repr. in idem, *Epochen der Bibelkritik* (Gesammelte Studien 3; Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 109; Munich: Kaiser, 1991), 186–215]; Silberman, "Wellhausen and Judaism," in *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, ed. Knight. A more recent analysis appears in Heschel's *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 209–13. On anti-Judaism in Protestant theology more generally, see Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany*; Christian Wiese, *Challenging Colonial Discourse: Jewish Studies and Protestant Theology in Wilhelmine Germany*, trans. idem and Barbara Harschav (Studies in European Judaism 10; Leiden: Brill, 2005); Anders Gerdmar, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

in Church history."[231] He may have seemed quite happy to see the state enlarge its own prerogatives against those of the church, yet he still assigned a value to the latter, affirming certain advantages to a distinction between the two. However, Wellhausen ultimately cast the church in a mere supporting role, one that operated largely in the background:

> The Church will always be able to work in advance for the state of the future. The present state unfortunately is in many respects only nothing more than a barrier to chaos; if the Church has still a task, it is that of preparing an inner unity of practical conviction, and awakening a sentiment, first in small circles, that we belong to each other.[232]

In these very lines, which materialized amidst an historiographic venture, the historian betrayed some of his greatest convictions: a partiality for the individual, an aversion to intrusive institutions, and a veneration of state power. Wellhausen proceeded to reflect on a religious individualism that he perceived in the gospel, placing accent on obedience, self-sacrifice, and faith. This subtle, unobtrusive sense of what religion entailed suited his favorite parable by Jesus: the seed growing secretly.[233] Indeed, Wellhausen's understanding of religion and society – like the histories of nations, states, and peoples that he wrote – was fit for a Protestant German Empire.

---

[231] Wellhausen, "Israel," 513.

[232] Ibid. At the time of the Great War, Wellhausen wrote to Hermann, "State is power, and power is originally based on violence and injustice; but it is only upon power that peace and culture are built, by the great predators putting an end to the small. The Pruss[ian] state did not arise without violence and injustice either, and it has the ambition to expand just like the English one, under the pretense of culture's royal law over and against the barbarians and also under the pretext of mission. Now it [sc. the Prussian state] is doubtless fully justified with respect to its enemies, thank God! But even were it at fault, I would neither want nor be able to renounce it. I do not cudgel my Christian brains about it" (Wellhausen to Herrmann, April 21, 1915, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 633); cf. p. 66 n. 5 above.

[233] See pp. 311–312 below.

Chapter Three

Religion's Past: Semites, Primitives, and Ancients

In the shrewd obituary he composed of Wellhausen, the Jewish Marburg philosopher Hermann Cohen (1842–1918) reckoned him neither a philosopher nor a proper historian and hence no philosopher of history. The departed had been, instead, a "religious moralist" in *Weltanschauung* and a powerful "painter of detail for philology and the study of antiquity."[1] To understand Wellhausen's relationship to scholarship on the Bible, he advised, one must see him less as an historian than philologist, and to understand his relationship to religion more generally, he counseled, one must see how Wellhausen's disposition and his character bound him to religion.[2] In both cases, Cohen was correct. Born a Lutheran pastor's son, this scholar of ancient scriptures had died something of a late Enlightenment man: committed to the creed of a cold, hard science and devoted to a belief in the force of morality. The mid nineteenth century bequeathed him a deep faith in philological positivism.

Over a decade earlier, the semitist had commented on Cohen to another Marburg colleague, the Indo-Europeanist Justi, which revealed his own thoughts on things theoretical. Wellhausen declared he must himself seem like a "dirty pig" to the philosophically inclined ("these dear delicate idealistic souls"), confessing "the inclination to conduct myself like a barbarian and to strip the scent or pollen from the butterfly."[3] The empiricist continued, "My disposition is different from Cohen's, and I do not give a damn about humanistic philosophy, which normally only ponders what is already thought intuitively by others or experienced by entire peoples a[nd] communities." In grand abstraction he had little interest. On a different occasion, exchanging letters with Nöldeke, Wellhausen expressed an aversion to philosophy in general – which he deemed "outright unproductive" – and stated his conviction in the necessity of carefully proceeding from minutiae as in the natural sciences, of "gradually arriv[ing] at something large through

[1] Hermann Cohen, "Julius Wellhausen. Ein Abschiedsgruß," *Neue Jüdische Monatshefte* 2 (1918): 178–81, 180 [repr. in Bruno Strauß, ed., *Hermann Cohens Jüdisches Schriften*, Vol. 2, *Zur jüdischen Zeitgeschichte* (Veröffentlichungen der Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums; Berlin: Schwetschke & Sohn, 1924), 463–68], citation refers to the original publication. For a critique of Cohen's interpretation of Wellhausen with respect to Judaism, see Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber*, 259–61.

[2] Ibid., 178. Cohen outlined how these qualities impacted his work – for good and ill alike.

[3] Wellhausen to Justi, July 19, 1906, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 487.

accumulation of certain, small results."[4] Indeed, he placed a premium on the basic, the simple, the natural – in method as in form and substance. Seeing the Semites as "realists," he judged them as such cleverer than the Indians or Greeks and turned the common reproach for their allegedly aphilosophical nature into a compliment. The man of letters had no great love of poetry, nearly regretting that Greek epic came in verse instead of prose, and further opined, "Only the *intellects* (*Geister*) in which the ideas originate are actually real."[5] Wellhausen was drawn not to ideas themselves but to the persons and peoples who had formed them: the makers of music, the dreamers of dreams.

The orientalist may have trained his eye on ancient texts in hope of accessing the past, but that eye itself had long been trained. Irrespective of his antipathy to more conceptual concerns and regardless of any inherent ability, Wellhausen played a scholarly game and did so by an accepted set of rules, epistemological rules not unlearned or uncreated but often unconsidered and unspoken. Fundamentally, the questions asked, the problems perceived, the solutions found, and the tools applied all lay at the ready already. Even intuition was not entirely unconditioned. When he worked on reconstructions in the history of ancient Judaism, early Christianity, or formative Islam, the scholar of texts conformed to the standards of philological science – a pillar of liberal historicism.

Of course, like Wellhausen's own epistemology this science had come from somewhere. Assembled from heterogenous theories, assumptions, and instruments all developed by generations of scholars, philology consolidated into a particularly strong and an especially attractive way of knowing in the nineteenth-century Germanies, where it gained historical specificity through peculiar social and political arrangements. In a remarkable essay on the history of indology, which scrutinizes "deep orientalism," Sheldon Pollock has suggested a cluster of actors and operations bricolaged to form that very *Wissenschaft* which came to characterize German knowledge production in this period and that ultimately combined with romanticism and orientalism in the period of National Socialism:

> The characteristics of this "science" merit historical analysis no less than the construction of romanticism. An inventory of the epistemological instruments of *Indologie* would include, besides Bopp's comparative linguistics, other nineteenth-century intellectual technologies developed for the human sciences, such as the text-criticism of Wolf and Lachmann, the philology of Böckh, and the historiography of Ranke.[6]

---

[4] Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 2, 1905, in ibid., 463–65, at 464.

[5] Ibid., italics original. "I am happy that the old Jews did not philosophize," he added, "and therefore have no affinity for Qohelet" (ibid.). Cf. also Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 9, 1879, in ibid., 59–60; Wellhausen to Schwartz, February 15, 1907, in ibid., 499–501; Wellhausen to Harnack, October 5, 1909, in ibid., 543–44.

[6] Sheldon Pollock, "Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power beyond the Raj," in *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia*, ed. Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), 76–133, at 84, italics original. Pollock continues, "What above all interests me here, however, is the general

This desideratum proves equally important for understanding other fields of philological knowledge in the nineteenth century, including Semitic and biblical scholarship.

A compelling framework for analyzing such an ensemble appears in Bernard Dionysius Geoghegan's incisive history of what he calls the "cybernetic apparatus" from the twentieth century. Considering the ambiguity of the word apparatus in English, which encompasses both *dispositif* and *appareil* in French, he disarticulates two distinguishable levels that came to operate together: not only "instruments and techniques … that acted as material aids or guides to research" but also "the politics of knowledge [that] enabled these material instruments and techniques to morph into ostensibly immaterial ideals that furnished researchers with procedures for investigations unhindered by historical, political, or disciplinary difference."[7] Geoghegan exploits this semantic dislocation to gain leverage on the strategies and organization of systems in the human sciences, particularly with information theory, communication technology, and linguistics in North America and France. Both structuring and structured, a similar ensemble of differences – a *philological apparatus* – assembled and generated specific forms of knowledge in nineteenth-century Germania, a structure of relations that encompassed multiple disciplines and drew its power precisely from an obscured disunity and diversity. As a modern master of ancient texts, Wellhausen occupied a place within this complex. Analysis of what he did thus helps explain what, exactly, that apparatus was.

With such questions on the horizon, this chapter excavates the underlying, oft implicit practices and theories of Wellhausen's work on the past. First, the analysis examines a philological positivism that underwrote his historicist endeavors. It surveys the kind of scholarship he thought possible and best, important and indispensable for accessing antiquity given the tools at hand and the limitation of sources. Next, discussion turns to the thrust of Wellhausen's own philological undertakings. Surveying his diagnosis of the problem and his proposed solution for reconstruction of the ancient world, it shows how he applied a history of literature for purchase on the past. The history of composition therefore corresponded to the larger history of a people or tradition. Third, this chapter reviews the relationship between the philologist and philosophical models then considered boons or boogeymen. Defenders and detractors have, already in his own day, debated just how much the spirits of Hegel, Darwin, Comte, and other such figures

---

conceptual framework within which these components combine to operate. Part of this framework consists in the claim of objectivity, of 'value-free scholarship,' which seems to have been more vigorously asserted the deeper the crisis of European culture grew" (ibid.).

[7] Bernard Dionysius Geoghegan, "From Information Theory to French Theory: Jakobson, Lévi-Strauss, and the Cybernetic Apparatus," *Critical Theory* 38, no. 1 (2011): 96–126, at 98; see further idem, *From Information Theory to French Theory: A Media Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (working title), forthcoming.

of philosophical note may have blown through the philologist's work. Given the highness of the stakes even still today, a review of the historiographic models available to the historian, which may have guided his thinking and writing on the past either consciously or not, merits reconsideration. Fourthly, the inquiry assesses the underlying epistemology in Wellhausen's enterprise of retrieving past phenomena. Whatever the data set – its language, tradition, or time – the same conceptual substructure, with its attendant operations, supported all his ventures of correlating history and texts no matter his aversion to sustained philosophical rumination. If Wellhausen's conception of textual development directed his accounts of the past, a still more basic understanding of historical progression guided the narrative and even criticism of that textual development itself. Though often buried deeply, these intellectual foundations sustained all his efforts in past religion: they thus require excavation.

3.1 Philological Positivism

In 1884, Wellhausen proposed to his publisher, Georg Reimer (1804–1885), "an intermittently-published journal, to be written by me alone and headed under the title: *Vorarbeiten und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Hebräer und der Araber*."[8] The label alone betrays his notion of almost all his intellectual toils: preparatory studies and sketches. Indeed, he devoted most of his efforts to spadework. Apart from his two articles in the ninth edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica* (namely, "Israel" and "Mohammedanism, Part 1, Mohammed and the First Four Caliphs"), Wellhausen composed only two "positive" histories in his lifetime: *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz* and *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*.[9] Even the first, however, he had originally conceived as part of *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams* – a work he concluded with the simple declaration: "I hope to have hammered home that historiography floats in the air without such prolegomena."[10] Initially entitled *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, Wellhausen's acclaimed examination of ancient Israelite tradition also saw retitling before its second edition, when it became the more modest *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*.[11]

---

[8] Wellhausen to Reimer, February 4, 1884, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 140–41; cf. p. 110 above.

[9] Cf. Martin Hartmann, review of *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam*, by Julius Wellhausen, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 5, no. 3 (1902): 96–104, at 104; see also the foreword to the second edition of *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1 (i. e., the first of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*), iii.

[10] Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.1, *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams*, 146; cf. idem, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, xvi.

[11] See the preface to Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, iii; see further Wellhausen to Reimer, July 1, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 105–06; cf. Wellhausen to Reimer, September 21, 1882, in ibid., 109–10; Wellhausen to Reimer, September 24, 1882, in ibid, 110; Wellhausen to Reimer, January 24, 1883, in ibid., 116. Cf. pp. 77–85 above.

Though inexplicitly so, much of his industry in the New Testament worked in the same direction.[12] This propensity for writing prolegomena – that is, prologues or introductions, literally "things said beforehand" – indicates just how much the philologist in Wellhausen conformed to the positivist drive propelled by high liberal historicism.[13]

Toiling in the mines of textual history, Wellhausen mostly resigned himself to what he considered critical endeavors – critical in two senses: analytical and essential. The scholar of three scriptures hoped to uncover the history of ancient texts themselves, from their initial composition through their subsequent revision to their transmission over time.[14] For this reason, he promoted production of the necessary tools. Asked by the Prussian *Kultusministerium* for an expert opinion on the proposal by Alfred Rahlfs (1865–1935) for an edition of the Septuagint, he acknowledged the potential concerns with such prolonged preliminary work, noting the problems de Lagarde had faced. "But these preliminary studies (*Vorarbeiten*)," he advised, "that is, the preparation of the texts of the subsequent oriental versions, are also valuable in and of themselves, regardless of the final goal; they absolutely deserve to be made and published independently."[15] In the same way, Wellhausen recommended the Göttingen Society of the Sciences cease production of its in-house publications altogether and instead allocate that funding to "greater scien[tific] works," such as lexica.[16]

[12] Cf. Dahl, "Wellhausen on the New Testament," 95; Smend, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," 446. So, too, he declared *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* not a textured, vibrant portrait but a more basic outline (Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, 7).

[13] On this dimension of historicism, see further Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, esp. 74–84, cf. 178–88; Georg G. Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*, rev. ed. (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), esp. 130–31; idem, "Historicism: The History and Meaning of the Term," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56, no. 1 (1995): 129–52; for an overview of historicism's impact on specifically biblical scholarship, see Gunter Scholtz, "The Phenomenon of 'Historicism' as a Backcloth of Biblical Scholarship," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 64–89.

[14] So he wrote in the (untranslated) preface to *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, with reference to his article "Israel": "For those who have not noticed it themselves, I believe I have demonstrated through a sketch published in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* that my criticism is the substructure for a positive construction" (idem, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, iii).

[15] Wellhausen to the Prussian Ministry of Cultural Affairs, August 19, 1907, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 521. Referring to his translation of the Psalms, Wellhausen considered a critical edition of the Old Testament text utter "nonsense" (*Unsinn*): Wellhausen to Anthony Ashley Bevan, April 20, 1896, in ibid., 337. Rahlfs's project ultimately ran for over a century, from 1907 until 2015, under the auspices of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, although it ended before completion: see Christian Schäfer, *Alfred Rahlfs (1865–1935) und die kritische Edition der Septuaginta. Eine biographisch-wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studie* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 489; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016).

[16] Wellhausen to Justi, March, 5, 1893, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 301–02. In his student days, Wellhausen had written philosopher Gustav Teichmüller (1832–1888) and expressed his in-

So, too, he discouraged the Society from supporting a planned encyclopedia of Islam, which he considered far too premature given a deficiency in the sources edited and analyzed; rather than this reference work, he championed additional editions and analyses of texts.[17] In a similar fashion, Wellhausen explicitly refrained from offering a thorough political or military history of the Arab–Byzantine wars – "since my talents and perhaps also the tradition is insufficient for it" – in favor of an attempt to reconcile information from the Byzantine and the Arab sources with special attention to chronology.[18] This nineteenth-century savant – who furnished contributions on three separate ancient literatures, reviewed works written in English, Dutch, French, Italian, and Latin, composed texts of his own in Latin, and filled his correspondence with citations of not only Hebrew, Arabic, Greek, and Latin but also Persian, Aramaic, and Ethiopic – entertained that cyclical nostalgia for the erudition of olden days as well: "But who could believe that we would now find ourselves at the [same] level as the 17th century? It sounds like a fairytale that [Samuel] Bochart was a pastor and [Richard] Bentley a theologian by training. The times will not return; but a little more philology, a little more knowledge, and a little more ignorance do not belong to the impossible desires."[19] Wellhausen did not believe the past was beyond reach,

---

creasing interest in languages, saying he would happily go into etymology or grammar were it not for "a kind of counterweight in theology" (Wellhausen to Gustav Teichmüller, March 11, 1866, in ibid., 3–4). Forty years onward, in a rather typically self-deprecating manner, he responded in private to the critique of his commentary on John, which apparently included reproof of his competence in Greek, "I am actually no [classical] philologist at all, only a hermeneutist of things congenial to me. I have nothing of the old Gildemeister or of Nöldeke in me, much less of Grotefend or Littmann" (Wellhausen to Schwartz, September 27, 1908, in ibid., 531–32).

[17] Wellhausen to the Göttingen Society of the Sciences, [May 13, 1900,] in ibid., 385–86; cf. his negative assessment of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*: Wellhausen to Ernst Ehlers, October 31, 1901, in ibid., 404–05.

[18] Julius Wellhausen, "Die Kämpfe der Araber mit den Romäern in der Zeit der Umaijiden," in Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der Königl*[*ichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1901* (Göttingen: Dieterich [Horstmann], 1902), 414–47, at 416 [ET: "Arab wars with the Byzantines in the Umayyad period," trans. Michael Bonner, in *Arab-Byzantine relations in early Islamic times*, ed. Michael Bonner (Formation of the Classical Islamic World 8; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 31–64].

[19] Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., ed. Wellhausen, 656. This line ended his appendix on the history of Old Testament scholarship and thus the book. On Wellhausen's wistful longing for the learned days of the *ancien régime*, whose ruin he attributed to the Revolution, see Wellhausen to Nöldeke, January 24, 1914, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 615; Wellhausen to Littmann, [November 26, 1914,] in ibid., 628. The scholarly values he upheld also came to the fore in his biographical portraits of Johann Jacob Reiske (1716–1774) and Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (1808–1899): see Julius Wellhausen, "Reiske, Johann Jacob," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., Vol. 20 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1886), 354–55; idem, "Ferdinand Wüstenfeld," in Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, *Nachrichten von der Königl*[*ichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Gesellschaftliche Mittheilungen aus dem Jahre 1899* (Göttingen: Dieterich [Horstmann], 1899), 79–80; idem, "Wüstenfeld: H. Ferdinand W.," *Allgemeine Deut-*

but he maintained the right materials to build that bridge of history were often woefully insufficient for the task.

Unsurprisingly, perhaps, the critic leveled criticism also in the opposite direction. Wellhausen complained of the arabists, for example, who "with few exceptions only edit but do not read or understand [and] only worry about the language and not the material (*Sachen*)."[20] Similarly, praising Smith's newly published *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, he drew a contrast between this "brilliant" volume and "the unfruitful, trivial collecting (*Kleinigkeitssammelei*) of the German orientalists, who have no idea where they should begin with their erudition and have never ever had a real problem in their lives."[21] Smith, conversely, had the power to shift from synchrony to diachrony, to bring the individual elements from "*alongside*" to "*behind*" one another, that is, in succession: he could understand the pieces from the whole and thereby "construct the tree out of each leaf."[22] Wellhausen further derided his colleagues in early Christianity for their feeble lack of breadth. "The still not yet extinct *man-of-one-book* (*homo unius libri*) among the specialists, who knows nothing more than the New Testament and the latest literature about it," he taunted, "will in any case not bring us forward."[23] (Nor did the classicists escape his mockery. As he ridiculed, "The classical philologists with their classical orthodoxy make themselves even more ridiculous than the theologians with their biblical orthodoxy."[24] In a seemingly false prophecy, the Semitic philologist pronounced classical philology was "dying out": "Such an old thing cannot last forever anyway," he wrote.[25]) No matter how deeply into the texts Wellhausen may have dug, he kept his philological eye on the historical prize, never casting doubt on the possibility of building synthesis out of analysis.[26] Nonetheless, he often felt the time had not yet come for grand synthetic portraits of the past.

---

sche Biographie, Vol. 55, *Nachträge bis 1899: Wandersleb–Zwirner* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1910): 139–40.

[20] Wellhausen to Justi, June 7, 1898, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 358–59; cf. also Wellhausen to Smith, [November 30, 1885], in ibid., 188.

[21] Wellhausen to Smith, November 7, 1889, in ibid., 237–38, at 237; cf. Wellhausen to de Lagarde, [early October 1876], in ibid., 35; see also Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, xiii. The work in question was William Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: First Series, The Fundamental Institutions*, 1st ed. (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1889); cf. also idem, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: Second and Third Series*, ed. with an introduction by John Day (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 183; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995 [1890, 1891]).

[22] Wellhausen to Smith, November 7, 1889, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 237–38, at 237, italics original.

[23] Wellhausen, "Des Menschen Sohn," in idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.2, *Verschiedenes*, 187–215, at 215.

[24] Wellhausen to Nöldeke, January 11, 1899, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 364; cf. also Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 18, 1905, in ibid., 466–67.

[25] Wellhausen to Justi, October 16, 1896, in ibid., 343–44.

[26] Cf. pp. 77–85 above.

Wellhausen did, of course, recognize the (re)constructing nature of historiography, which he affirmed privately and publicly alike. Reflecting on the treatment of sources in his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, the philologist famously declared, "But history, it is well known, has always to be constructed …," emphasizing, "The question is whether one constructs well or ill."[27] As with the proposed encyclopedia of Islam, however, he could express a real reservation towards too much – or at least too hurried – reassembly of the past when he found the foundation unsound. In a letter from 1891, for instance, he alluded to the "dreadful bustle of children's work" on the Old Testament.[28] Although Wellhausen did affirm a sympathy to the allure of voguish *Religionsgeschichte*, he stressed that history itself must be assembled first. "But the constructing is fun, and you need not read or learn too much [to do it]," this old guardsman scoffed. "Everything is condensed in a book; commentaries and concordances are everywhere."[29] In arabistics, Aloys Sprenger (1813–1893) served as a deterrent. Sprenger, who had worked in India for the British colonial administration, journeyed across Asias South and West, learned Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Urdu, and produced volumes on lexicography, geography, and grammar as well as translations, text editions, and catalogues of manuscripts, did not possess the proper linguistic or textual skills in the verdict delivered by Wellhausen, who – albeit typically for the time – appears rarely, if ever, to have made it east of Berlin or south of Rome.[30] Noting Sprenger's book on Muhammad had commanded the market in Germany, he did not fully discredit the work but did make an example of its author in his assessment of the volume. This protégé of de Lagarde and Ewald pronounced his evaluation: "Philology takes revenge for her disdain."[31] The wise man would not construct the house of history on philological sand.

---

[27] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 367; cf. also his critique of Nöldeke (ibid., 46). These two statements are conflated in Kurtz, "Axes of Inquiry," 264. Further to Wellhausen's sense of reconstruction, see Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 185–206; Kratz "Eyes and Spectacles"; cf. also Boschwitz, *Julius Wellhausen*, 39.

[28] Wellhausen to Harnack, May 21, 1891, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 267.

[29] Ibid. However, Wellhausen showed more optimism for such work on the New Testament.

[30] For biography on this Tyrolean-born, Austrian-, French-, and Dutch-educated, British- and Swiss-naturalized, and later German-resident Catholic professor of oriental languages at the University of Bern, see Stephan Procházka, "Sprenger, Aloys Ignatz Christoph (1813–1893)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 51:986–87.

[31] Wellhausen, *Muhammed in Medina*, 26, cf. 20–26 more broadly; see also Wellhausen to Dillmann, August 11, 1879, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 61; Wellhausen to Smith, [August/September 1881?,] in ibid., 89; Wellhausen to Smend, November 17, 1891, in ibid., 271. The volume in question was Aloys Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Moḥammad nach bisher größtentheils unbenutzten Quellen*, 1st ed., 3 vols. (Berlin: Nicolai, 1861–65); 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Berlin: Nicolai, 1869); cf. also idem, *The Life of Mohammad from Original Sources* (Allahabad: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1851); idem *Mohammed und der Koran. Eine psychologische Studie* (Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge n.s. 4/84–85; Hamburg: Verlagsanstalt und Druckerei A[ctien]-G[esellschaft] [Richter], 1889).

Despite the subjective element in historiography, Wellhausen never fell prey to the despair of relativism that gripped the *fin de siècle*, as a crisis of historicism unsettled so many others.[32] Such inevitable subjectivity did not preclude objective knowledge. For him, the past was knowable, and it was knowable through texts. The mirror of (certain) ancient sources did indeed demand some cleaning, but it still reflected portraits of the past. In consequence, Wellhausen placed great value on the power of judgment for interpretation, which accounts – though only in part – for his oft severe appraisal of other interpreters. Having stated in an early book on textual criticism, "One must have a preconception of the truth in order to find it," he surely maintained this position for the wider spectrum of scholarly ventures – convinced lifelong his own preconceptions were right.[33] For him, the past was therefore more discovered than history produced.

Academics at the turn of the century would eventually hurl the epithet of positivism at their fathers' generation. As Fritz Ringer has discerned, although the pejorative did spread far and wide, the charge itself proved vague and indirect, which in fact gave it particular strength insofar as such an ill-defined indictment cemented a general feeling of agreement among the accusers.[34] But the accusation was not strictly accurate. The philosophical positivism of an August Comte (1798–1857) or Henry Thomas Buckle (1821–1862) never gained much traction in the germanophone human sciences.[35] This Teutonic form of positivism privileged the collection of raw empirical facts to the detriment of spoken stress upon its operative yet unacknowledged metaphysical commitments while attempting to accumulate those facts through a panacean scientific method. Concerned with causal connections in the past, such endeavors simply assumed that cultural productions (i. e., the objectifications of spirit) corresponded to the internal thought of their producers, that this internal thought reflected a past reality, and that these external facts could then enter the mind of the historian to yield not only information about the past but even generalizations about the course of history itself. In the process, they reduced an earlier stress upon the Kantian critique, which plunged the depths of the relationship between object and ideal and between experience, knowledge, and the external world. They did not mind the gap.[36]

[32] For a reappraisal of this phenomenon, see Herman J. Paul, "A Collapse of Trust: Reconceptualizing the Crisis of Historicism," *Journal of the Philosophy of History* 2 (2008): 63–82; idem, "Religion and the Crisis of Historicism: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives," *Journal of the Philosophy of History* 4 (2010): 172–94.

[33] Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 7 n. 1, cf. also 14 n. 1.

[34] See Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins*, esp. 295–304, cf. also 83–102; cf. also pp. 272–82 below.

[35] In consequence, interpreters of Wellhausen have dismissed the charge, based on such specific definitions and associations: cf. Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 80–85; John Barton, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 51–52.

[36] As Ringer has discerned, "On the whole, this process was more unconscious than deliberate. But it led men to act as if materialistic or positivistic conceptions of knowledge were acceptable to them. They were too busy to state their positions formally. They simply created

Together with this fault for absence, i. e., a failure to meditate on theoretical concerns, the indictment of positivism also admonished the presence of unwanted principles in the understanding of history. When inductive, naive, empirical aggregations of data did find a frame to give them historiographical form – in this accounting – even that frame was unacceptable. The rebuke assaulted several basic elements characteristic of historicist ventures before the 1890s generation came of age: discernible laws in history, developmental stages in society, and inevitable progress in time.[37] Yet these principles lay at the very foundation of German historicism. They represented well-trodden – though doubtless not the only – paths in the forest of that historiographic tradition.

If the confidence in individuality, the belief in objectifications of a spirit (be it of a people or an epoch), and the faith in a unity and purpose of history, among other things, indicate the kind of philosophical premises built into the structure of this enterprise, then the focus on facts, the collection of data, the aversion to abstraction, and the trust in knowledge suggest the sort of post-romantic epistemology also present in it. The philological endeavor of such *Wissenschaft* was not strictly a positivism of the Anglo-French variety, an idealism of the earlier (as well as later) German sort, or a mere empiricism. This historicist or philological positivism represented a distinctive way of knowing.

As Wellhausen went to work on texts and through them sought to reach antiquity, he conformed to this same undertaking. However, the complexities in both the wider and the deeper intellectual history of the human sciences, the infrequency of sustained meditation on epistemology and methodology so typical of the age, and the tendency among his own interpreters to focus more narrowly on product rather than production (i. e., the content of his conclusions in relationship to others, less the assumptions implied in those methods which yielded that data) have all hindered a fuller, more nuanced understanding of Wellhausen's scholarship. While an epistemic optimism ensured him access to the past, largely implicit philosophical positions provided a blueprint according to which the philologist could analyze texts – by heavily empirical methods – and then assemble these building blocks in preparation for positive historiographical construction. As Georg Iggers has written of the famed historian Johann Gustav Droysen (1808–1884), Wellhausen, too, had "faith that history is a meaningful, lawful, and progressive process which the historian could understand to a high degree" and "that historical study requires understanding of its subject matter rather than causal explanation."[38] This faith underpinned his entire oeuvre. Be-

---

the impression that they had temporarily forgotten the Kantian criticism, that they were allowing themselves to slide from an unstudied empiricism or realism toward the unconscious metaphysical assumptions of the common-sense heresy. It was this intellectual tendency which came under attack beginning around 1890" (idem, *The Decline of the German Mandarins*, 298).

[37] Cf. esp. ibid., 144–46, 172–73, 302–04, 340–44.

[38] Iggers, *The German Conception of History*, 109.

fore retracing how he aimed to understand the ancient past and examining the conceptual bearings that helped him do so, the analysis first turns to a review of what, exactly, he thought the problem of history to be.

3.2 Different Data, Persistent Problem, Same Solution

The very nature of Wellhausen's scholarship has caused no little disagreement. Whereas Cohen argued, "he was not, in the strict sense, so much an historian as a philologist," Boschwitz directly countered this conclusion, asserting, "nothing could be falser."[39] Indeed, the question of philology or history has persisted for nearly a century.[40] The choice itself entails a number of oft conflated factors: the longer institutional history of which subjects underwent which kinds of analysis on which faculties at which universities during which time, the basic principles of historiography – with its strong fixation on texts – leading up to the *fin de siècle*, the way he conceived his own endeavors, the subsequent reception of his ventures in the fields in which he worked, and even the self-identity of interpreters, who may themselves have a stake in the designation. In view of these concerns, the phrase "historicizing philologist" may well be the most appropriate.[41]

Wellhausen himself considered philology and history to be two intrinsically connected enterprises. In correspondence with Schwartz, he prescribed, with characteristic concision, "… the historian must operate not *en gros* but always *en detail*, i. e., he must be a philologist, but conversely, the philologist also an historian."[42] When admitted to the Order *Pour le Mérite*, however, Wellhausen relished

[39] Cohen, "Julius Wellhausen," 178, cf. 180; Boschwitz, *Julius Wellhausen*, 7.

[40] For Wellhausen as historian, see, inter alia, Eißfeldt, "Julius Wellhausen," esp. 57; Aulikki Nahkola, *Double Narratives in the Old Testament: The Foundations of Method in Biblical Criticism* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 290; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 93–103; Reinhard G. Kratz, "Einführung," in H. G. M. Williamson, *Holy, Holy, Holy: The Story of a Liturgical Formula* (Julius-Wellhausen-Vorlesung 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 1–14, at 2–3. For Wellhausen as philologist, see, e. g., Mangold, *Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft"*, 108; Rudolph, "Wellhausen as an Arabist," 116–17. For more nuance between these categories – including, at times, his rehabilitation as historian based on criteria then, rather than now – see, among others, Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum*, 245–68; Halpern, *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 21–24; Robert Oden, Jr., *The Bible Without Theology: The Theological Tradition and Alternatives to It* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 33–34 [repr., in part, as "Historical Understanding and Understanding the Religion of Israel," in *Community, Identity, and Ideology: Social Science Approaches to the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Charles Carter and Carol Meyers (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 6; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 201–29], citation here applies to the original; Hans Barstad, "What Prophets Do. Reflections on Past Reality in the Book of Jeremiah," in *Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah,* ed. idem and Reinhard Kratz (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 388; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 10–32, at 12. Cf. pp. 51–54 above.

[41] Cf. Marchand, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism," 139; idem, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 181.

[42] Wellhausen to Schwartz, [February 19, 1905,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 447.

the field of his appointment: history – and specifically not oriental philology.[43] Yet the real honor, for him, lay less in the nomination than in the suspected nominator: none other than Mommsen himself, whom he regarded "more valuable as a scholar on his own than all the Berlin historians and philologists together, not even excluding the dead ones."[44] Such acceptance – as an historian, by this historian – surely validated how he saw himself.

Indeed, Wellhausen celebrated the nineteenth-century's heroes of ancient history. While he read the proofs of *Römische Geschichte*, as well as those of other works, and though the two exchanged their publications, the semitist had the feeling he could only ever learn from – never teach – his hero Mommsen.[45] Wellhausen even named him his "ideal," an expert of details, a virtuoso of understanding, and a master of presentation.[46] The praise was therefore high when he called Smith "an historical jurist like Mommsen himself," "a juridical draftsman (*juristischer Constructeur*) of whom there are few."[47] (Acting as emancipator, the classicist may have also aided Wellhausen as he sought to escape his Greifswald post in theology.[48]) In like manner, the orientalist admired the Swiss historian of art and culture Jacob Burckhardt (1818–1897). If Wellhausen savored Burkhardt's *Griechische Kulturgeschichte* with "the greatest pleasure," he reportedly devoured *Weltgeschichtliche Betrachtungen* five times over.[49] An eye for detail, a

[43] Wellhausen to Helene Justi, [March 21, 1900,] in ibid., 380; cf. pp. 58–59 above.

[44] Ibid. Here, Wellhausen also elevated Mommsen above von Ranke; cf. also Wellhausen to Georg Reimer, February 4, 1884, in ibid., 140–41. Similarly, Wellhausen wrote of Vatke, "He is worth more in the eyes of God than the entire living and even some dead generations of the Theology Faculty in Berlin" (Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 28, 1874, in ibid., 24–25, at 25).

[45] For his reading of the text, see Wellhausen to Mommsen, December 15, 1884, in ibid., 158–59; Wellhausen to Mommsen, January 4, 1885, in ibid., 160–63; Wellhausen to Mommsen, January 19, 1885, in ibid., 164–65; Wellhausen to Mommsen, January 21, 1885, in ibid., 166; Wellhausen to Smith, January 21, 1885, in ibid., 166–67; comments on other texts appear throughout their correspondence. On Wellhausen learning from Mommsen, see Wellhausen to the Limprichts, January 4, 1885, in ibid., 163–64; cf. Wellhausen to Mommsen, January 4, 1885, in ibid., 160–63; Wellhausen to Mommsen, March 20, 1885, in ibid., 171.

[46] So Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 5, 1878, in ibid., 47–49, contrasting Mommsen to the mere "critic" Alfred Freiherr von Gutschmid (1831–1887). He also admired his vigor: cf. Wellhausen to Smend, [September 14, 1893,] in ibid., 310; Wellhausen to Justi, December 23, 1899, in ibid., 376–77.

[47] Wellhausen to Smith, September 2, 1885, in ibid., 183–84, at 183; cf. also Wellhausen to Mommsen, June 7, 1890, in ibid., 257. Wellhausen extended the compliment with regard to Smith's *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, 1st ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1885). Self-effacing, Wellhausen remarked upon receipt of an honorary doctorate in the discipline that he himself actually knew nothing about law (Wellhausen to Justi, February 11, 1906, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 476; cf. Wellhausen to the Faculty of Law at the University of Greifswald, August 9, 1906, in ibid., 490); see pp. 32–33 above.

[48] Cf. Wellhausen to Olshausen, February 9, 1879, in ibid., 55–56.

[49] Wellhausen to Nöldeke, December 6, 1898, in ibid., 362–63; Boschwitz, *Julius Wellhausen*, 74, the latter citing Carl Neumann, *Jacob Burckhardt* (Munich: Bruckmann, 1927), 231 n. 1, cf. 31, 239. The works in questions were Jakob Burckhardt, *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*, 1st ed., 4 vols, ed. Jakob Oeri (Berlin: Spemann, [1898–1902]) [ET: *History of Greek Culture*, abr. ed., trans.

feel for presentation, and a grasp of "everything called culture" earned him special accolade.[50] Hardly one for hero-worship, Wellhausen could also see points to criticize in both these scholars' work, no matter how much he found worthy of acclaim.[51]

However, Mommsen and Burckhardt embodied two distinctive ventures in accessing antiquity. In a rather perspicacious passage, Baruch Halpern has examined how these two enterprises ultimately clashed in Wellhausen's historiography of ancient Israel, "the Mommsenian political history built to a Burckhardtian blueprint."[52] The critical *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* constituted, in line with Burckhardt's cultural history, a synchronic attempt at separating sources to yield information specifically on the time of their production and thereby to form sketches of individual stages in society, stages then linked by a chronological series. By contrast, the synthetic *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* represented a more ambitious, diachronic endeavor, like that of Mommsen, to evaluate those sources' very claims about the past and to reconstruct a political history – although it relied upon the development of a cultic or religious law, lacked an integration of politics and social structure, and depended on later sources otherwise deemed unreliable for information on still earlier historical events. As Wellhausen himself contended, "One must and yet only through the purely negative can attain a positive conception of the chronological order of certain phases, which contradict one another when taken simultaneously."[53] Contrastive, even contradictory, snapshots of phenomena from the past therefore formed a flip book. Halpern thus concludes, "The problem was Wellhausen's synthesis: he tried to graft Mommsen's diachronic history of the nation onto the antiphilological Burckhardt's purely synchronic history of the culture; he tried to base a political history on the history of theology."[54] So it was that history came to correspond

---

Palmer Hilty, 1st ed. (New York: Ungar, [1963]); *The Greeks and Greek Civilization*, abrd. ed., trans. Sheila Stern, ed. with an introduction by Oswyn Murray, 1st ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998)]; idem, *Weltgeschichtliche Betrachtungen*, ed. Jakob Oeri (Berlin: Spemann, 1905).

[50] Wellhausen to Nöldeke, December 6, 1898, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 362–63; cf. Wellhausen to Nöldeke, January 16, 1914, in ibid., 614.

[51] On Burckhardt, cf. Wellhausen to Nöldeke, December 6, 1898, in ibid., 362–63; Wellhausen to Nöldeke, January 11, 1899, in ibid., 365; Wellhausen to Schwartz, February 15, 1907, in ibid., 499–501. On Mommsen, cf. Wellhausen to Schwartz, June 2, 1910, in ibid., 560; Wellhausen to Bousset, May 30, 1914, in ibid., 621.

[52] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 16–35, quotation at 23. Written nearly thirty years ago, Halpern's volume stresses the importance of Wilamowitz to Wellhausen but overemphasizes him as the broker of Mommsen, which the recent publication of Wellhausen's letters now corrects.

[53] Wellhausen, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 5–6.

[54] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 25. Elaborating on the contrast, Halpern writes, "Burckhardt's method was purer: the sequence of synchronic stills was itself the history; Burckhardt ransacked the texts only for data about the times in which they were written. Mommsen used the information the sources divulged about contemporary society as a ladder into earlier history – his synchronic *political* gleanings enabled him to evaluate reports texts made about the time *before* they were written. So his method was, in fact, only synchronic at the outset. He used

with texts: "The tendency to approach Israelite history as the history of books fostered the delusion that historical battles could be fought at the level of compositional analysis."[55] Reconstruction of the past therefore meant a reconstruction of (a specific kind of) literature.

Through all of his endeavors – whether critical or synthetic, in ancient Judaism, early Christianity, or formative Islam – Wellhausen hoped to prune a textual tradition to reach its very core and thereby the truth about the past. Essaying to travel the path of texts and arrive at the oldest record recoverable, he consistently encountered one obstacle: accretion. As he considered different literatures of different ages in different languages from different regions, the philologist thus diagnosed the same pandemic:

> What is chiefly to be recovered (*nachzuholen*) here is the separation of the different reports. The works of the original reporters have not been preserved for us in their independent form but only as components of compilations.[56]

> … the whole area of tradition has finally been uniformly covered with an alluvial deposit by which the configuration of the surface has been determined. It is with this last that we have to deal in the first instance; to ascertain its character, to find out what the active forces were by which it was produced.[57]

> The sources have not been preserved for us in their oldest version. They have undergone a literary process and only in multiple stages grown into the inventory in which they now lie before us. And when the process largely stagnated, it was nonetheless continued in small measure and in a somewhat different manner.[58]

Each statement on its own would offer scarcely any hint as to the data set in question. In essence interchangeable, these three judgments – passed on a variety of sources written in Arabic, Hebrew, and Greek – appeared in works composed by Wellhausen across his whole career, first as Professor of Old Testament in Greifswald and then as Professor of Oriental Languages in Göttingen. Everywhere he looked, the philologist saw but one conundrum.

Just as he discerned a common problem, so also Wellhausen advanced a shared solution. Proceeding from one body of literature to another, the doctor of theo-

---

his grasp of a synchronic system only as a fixed point around which to organize the sources. He did not rest content, as Burckhardt did, with a sequence of stills" (ibid., 20–21, italics original).

[55] Ibid., 26. This assumed correspondence between literature and history raised the stakes of the debate. As Shavit and Eran articulate such implications in their thorough – and wonderfully bibliographophilic – volume, "Wellhausen's theory, then, did not argue only against the unity of the Pentateuch and date its writing to a later time; it also questioned the story it tells about the history of the Jewish faith" (Shavit and Eran, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn*, 101).

[56] Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.1, *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams* (Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 3; cf. also idem, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, xi–xiii.

[57] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 228. The quotation appeared already in that work's first edition (cf. *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, 238).

[58] Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1st ed., 4; cf. also idem, *Das Evangelium Johannis*, 6–7.

logy performed the selfsame operation: dissection. For this reason, accounts of Wellhausen's method as described by the secondary literature in each of his three fields betray remarkable consistency.[59] Be it for the history of Judaism, Christianity, or Islam, he inspected texts to distinguish primary from secondary, original from subsequent, and early from late in hope of elucidating error, settling discrepancy, and judging reliability on the past. Indeed, he devoted substantial time and energy to ascertain how later authors, compilers, and/or historians employed earlier (written) material and to establish which sources could provide the best evidence on the past. As Jean Louis Ska has underlined, Wellhausen judged reliability based on both the probability of the event in question and the coherency of the larger narrative at hand.[60] One tool for this procedure involved the identification of distinctive tendencies or orientations (*Tendenzen*) within a text. Considering any given text a document of history – a production conditioned by the past – this analysis of dispositions and perspectives, of motives and interests sought to gain leverage in the gap between the past event narrated and the narration itself, which then permitted a gradual if painstaking disassembly into its various parts. Now, Wellhausen did recognize the ineludible entanglement of investigations textual, linguistic, and literary, even if he could rarely be bothered to ruminate on such concerns, and he did display a fine sensitivity to the possibilities and limitations of his multiplex sources.[61] Such nuance notwithstanding, the quest continued apace. The past, embedded as layers of text, was an onion to be peeled. But the scent grew sweeter as he worked his way towards the center, removing later layers to arrive at the record of greatest antiquity.

---

[59] For Hebrew Bible, see Machinist, "The Road Not Taken," esp. 496–521; Kratz "Eyes and Spectacles"; idem, "Die Entstehung des Judentums. Zur Kontroverse zwischen E. Meyer and J. Wellhausen," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 95, no. 2 (1998): 167–84 [repr. in idem, *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels,* 1st ed. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 1/42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 6–22]; Nahkola, *Double Narratives in the Old Testament*, 93–103. For Islam, see Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 9–11; Rudolph, "Wellhausen as an Arabist," 116–21; Michael Bonner, *Jihad in Islamic History: Doctrines and Practice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 65–67. For New Testament, see Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*, 5th ed. (Aus der Welt der Religion, n.s. 1; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966), 13–16; idem, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 10th ed. (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 29, n.s. 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 1–3; idem, "The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem," *Journal of Religion* 6, no. 4 (1926): 337–62.

[60] Jean Louis Ska, "The 'History of Israel': Its Emergence as an Independent Discipline," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 307–45, at 338–40; for another instance, among others, cf. also Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 142.

[61] Cf., e. g., Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1st ed., 7–8, 65–67; idem, *Das Evangelium Johannis*, 119; idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.1, *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams*, 4, 146; idem, "Des Menschen Sohn," in idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.2, *Verschiedenes*, 215; idem, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, preface.

If both the problem posed and solution offered stayed consistent over his data, across his fields, and throughout his life, the elementary objective also remained a constant. Strewn all through extant literature and buried deep within it, those diamonds that were facts about the past required finding and then polishing to create, in time to come, the crown of history. Reviewing this type of scholarship, Lord Acton's (1834–1902) characterization of German "historical science" applies equally well to Wellhausen: "It was their belief that literature had long been an arduous and comprehensive conspiracy against truth, and that much envenomed controversy could be set at rest by exposing the manifold arts that veil substantial falsehood – suppression, distortion, interpolation, forgery, legend, myth."[62] Wellhausen hoped to set the record straight. He sought to do so by unsnarling the history of a warped literature.

This enterprise converged with other intellectual developments, of course, ones already long in the making. Some time ago, for example, Hans Frei identified a gradual yet seismic separation of "explicative meaning" and "historical factuality" in the interpretation of biblical narratives, the distance between a story told and the supposed reality depicted, whereby the text became a carrier of history instead of history itself.[63] So, too, Howard has seen in de Wette "a radical shift in biblical criticism *toward history*, but history of another kind – namely, the history of the texts themselves and their authors/editors and no longer of the events and the people which the texts narrated."[64] A similar transformation occurred in the sub- or crypto-theological conception of divine revelation no longer in but rather as history, a metaphysical or teleological force. The assiduous study of the past – preserved in original texts themselves recoverable through languages learned, strata sifted, and manuscripts edited – became a moral imperative in consequence. As Spieckermann has lucidly explained, "the source became an ideological compensation for the dismissed claims of tradition and institutions. After the canon's historical relativization, sources received canonical authority."[65] The call resounded for generations beyond the hills of biblical

[62] Lord Acton (John Dalberg-Acton), "German Schools of History," *The English Historical Review* 1, no. 1 (1886): 7–42, at 27.

[63] Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

[64] Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism*, 42.

[65] Hermann Spieckermann, "From Biblical Exegesis to Reception History," *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 1, no. 3 (2012): 327–50, at 330–31. Spieckermann writes, more broadly, "The goal, though, lay beyond scientifically verifiable historical reconstruction with all its uncertainties and various degrees of probability. Instead, the goal was nearness to the origins themselves. The assumption was that origins offer a pure, historical truth, however one understands the suggestive yet elusive marriage of history and truth. […] In the epochs of the Enlightenment and historicism, interpreters sought and found sources everywhere, particularly in the Pentateuch and the Gospels. Their function was twofold: the critique of established religion and the foundation of true religion" (ibid.).

scholarship: *ad fontes*. Those sources were the fount of fact and truth, even if their waters did require filtering.

Leading up to the *fin de siècle*, the chariot of bourgeois culture was drawn by those two stallions of classical and theological scholarship. With a common pedigree in the longer tradition of Christian humanism, they grew strong from historicism and its philological positivism in the course of the nineteenth century.[66] They also kept pace with one another. Indeed, historicist endeavors in biblical pasts may at times have followed the path of classicists with their science of antiquity, but in that age they also led at times. As Momigliano has detected,

> Wellhausen became a hero to Wilamowitz and Schwartz because he showed them that the same method was legitimate both on sacred and profane texts. Wellhausen also confirmed them in what they had already learned from Usener: that repudiation of theological presuppositions did not mean absence of religious emotions.[67]

Certainly, the understudied topic of convergence (and divergence) between classics and biblical studies still has much to reveal in the realm of epistemology and methodology for nineteenth-century research on antiquity. A distinct theoretical framework – no matter how unacknowledged – underwrote the questions pursued and the way of pursuing them and further validated a particular type of reconstruction. Not only throughout the fields in which Wellhausen labored but also across the human sciences, the problems and solutions were the same. Crucially, neither theory nor method was data-specific.

3.3 Philosophy among the Anti-Philosophical

The book of Acts reports a miracle of language. As the apostles sat together on Shavuot, "[d]ivided tongues, as of fire, appeared among them, and a tongue rested on each of them. All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other languages, as the Spirit gave them ability."[68] Two millennia later, during Whitsuntide, 1907, Wellhausen also spoke another tongue – although against his will. That language was philosophy. Visiting Marburg for the holiday, he "had to philosophize" with Cohen and Wilhelm Herrmann (1846–1922), which "came to me as hard as lamming to the ram; time and again I slipped through the net."[69] With a fellow specialist of texts, by contrast, he was able to speak his

[66] See further Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 1–52; Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 93–117; Michael C. Legaspi, *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies* (Oxford Studies in Historical Theology; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 79–104.

[67] Momigliano, "Religious History Without Frontiers," 63.

[68] Acts 2:3–4 (New Revised Standard Version).

[69] Wellhausen to Harnack, May 26, 1907, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 517–18, at 517; Wellhausen to Heinrich and Charlotte Limpricht, May 26, 1907, in ibid., 518.

own vernacular: "I discussed fervently with Jülicher, not about philosophy and dogmatics but topics closer to me," he recounted.[70] In words not only written but also spoken, Wellhausen avoided such abstraction. As he once penned to Nöldeke, "The true philosophy is not to philosophize."[71] Schwartz earned his respect for respecting these same boundaries, for even when he "philosophized or theologized, as it were," he did so strictly as a philologist.[72] Though less overt, debated, or considered, real philosophical principles still underwrote the venture of historicist philology, especially concerning human development over time, the proper means of accessing the past, and even the nature of history itself. Despite or precisely because of their unobtrusive presence, much intellectual labor has since sought to expose or deny the origins, existence, and effect of such theoretical structures with respect to Wellhausen's historiographic work. Rather than waste his readers' time, more discussion of methodology would, in fact, have spared much of his subsequent interpreters'. Nonetheless, the operative epistemological commitments do, at times, seep through the language of even hefty philological inquiries.

Now, forests' worth of trees have lost their lives to the trite debate over Wellhausen's precise relationship to the philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831), with Vatke allegedly being Hegel's broker. In fact, Lothar Perlitt devoted an entire volume to the subject.[73] One set of obstacles for those who seek

[70] Wellhausen to Harnack, May 26, 1907, in ibid., 517–18, at 517.

[71] Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 2, 1905, in ibid., 463–65, at 464. Likewise, he wrote to Littmann, "If I had it in me, I could philosophize. But I am only a philosopher insofar that I have realized: the best philosophy is that one does not philosophize but simply believes: *and though I walk through a valley of deepest darkness, I will fear no harm*. Theology is, of course, still further from me than philosophy" (Wellhausen to Littmann, October 28, 1911, in ibid., 578–79, at 579, with the italics being a quotation of Ps 23:4 in Hebrew).

[72] Wellhausen to Schwartz, December 2, 1909, in ibid., 549.

[73] Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*; see further Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber*, 80–85. For an overview of the central arguments and principal arguers on both sides, cf. also Thompson, *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf*, 37–41. Perlitt's volume has since become a common point of reference for this contestation, receiving strong evaluations from champions and challengers alike. Frank Moore Cross, for instance, judges that Perlitt "tries mightily to free Wellhausen from the heritage of Vatke and Hegel, but succeeds only in revealing his own inability to stand apart from that same tradition whose influence is still pervasive in German Old Testament scholarship. Had Wellhausen proceeded purely as a positivistic historian, his great synthesis would never have been written, and he would not have become the powerful figure he was and is" (idem, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973], 82 n. 9). By contrast, Barton opines, "The old canard that his approval of Vatke's historical work indicates that Wellhausen was himself a Hegelian has been laid to rest by Perlitt, though one still hears it said" (idem, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*, 51; cf. also Kratz, "Julius Wellhausen [1844–1918] und die Geschichte," 108); elsewhere, he avers, once more supporting Perlitt, "To suggest that Wellhausen's thinking in the 1870s was Hegelian is thus a hopeless anarchism" (idem, "Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*: Influences and Effects," in *Text & Experience: Towards a Cultural Exegesis of the Bible*, ed. Daniel Smith-Christopher [Biblical Seminar 35; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], 316–29, at 320 [repr. in idem,

to free him from any such dependence has arisen from his own formulations. Sketching a sequence of biblical narrative, for instance, Wellhausen remarked, "One is reminded of the 'Satz,' 'Gegensatz,' and 'Vermittelung' of the Hegelian philosophy when one's ear has once been caught by the monotonous beat with which the history here advances, or rather moves in a circle."[74] Such an oblique reference may suggest a more general, in point of fact rather expected, awareness but hardly documents any specific indebtedness.[75]

Greater guilt has come by association. When Wellhausen expressed a special veneration of Vatke – "from whom indeed I gratefully acknowledge myself to have learnt best and most" – he opened Pandora's box and set Hegel's specter free.[76]

The Old Testament: Canon, Literature and Theology. Collected Essays of John Barton (Society for Old Testament Study Series; Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007), 169–79], citation relates to the original publication). Smend has declared the classification of Wellhausen as a Hegelian "today definitely disproved" (idem, "Wellhausen, Julius," in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., Vol. 21, *Wel-Zy*, ed. Fred Skolnik [Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 2007], 6–7); the staunchest of all defenders, Smend has frequently adduced this work by Perlitt to advance such claims as "The untenability of this portrait is obvious to everyone who knows Hegel, Vatke, and Wellhausen even superficially" (idem, review of *Vatke und Wellhausen. Geschichtsphilosophische Voraussetzungen und historiographische Motive für die Darstellung der Religion und Geschichte Israels durch Wilhelm Vatke und Julius Wellhausen*, by Lothar Perlitt, *Vetus Testamentum* 16, no. 1 [1966]: 130–34, at 130).

[74] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 231. Ostensibly aiding foreign readers, the English translation added the explicit reference to "Hegelian philosophy" and did not render the German words as, say, thesis, antithesis, and synthesis (cf. idem, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 240). Barton has cited this passage to distance Wellhausen from said philosophy: "No one who was a Hegelian himself could have written that scornful sentence!" (idem, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*, 51 n. 52). In an attempt to extricate Wellhausen from said philosophical system, Smend has presented in the process a mediated dialectic, whether wittingly or not: "As explained above, historical criticism of the Old Testament in the 19th century transpired – if one considers the criticism of the law as its core and focuses on only the truly epoch-making works – in three stages: 1. deconstructive analysis without systematic, philosophical presuppositions and determined by the intention of the texts (de Wette); 2. historical synthesis with the use of Hegel's philosophy of history (Vatke); 3. historical synthesis freed from the philosophical system (Wellhausen). This movement is appropriate and consequential" (Rudolf Smend, "De Wette und das Verhältnis zwischen historischer Bibelkritik und philosophischem System im 19. Jahrhundert," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 14 [1958]: 107–19, at 115 [repr. in idem, *Epochen der Bibelkritik* (Gesammelte Studien 3; Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 109; Munich: Kaiser, 1991), 145–54], cited according to the original publication); remarkably, this statement first came, chronologically, closer to the year of Wellhausen's death than to the present day. Perhaps not entirely disconnected from this kind of mediation, Wellhausen himself also asserted, "A coming reconciliation between believing and seeing, between morality and nature, everywhere forms the background of His [sc. Jesus'] view of the world; even if He could have done without it for His own person, yet it is a thing He takes for granted, as it is an objective demand of righteousness" (Wellhausen, "Israel," 512). For a subtle exploration of dialectics implied in Wellhausen's historiography, see Weidner, "The Political Theology of Ethical Monotheism."

[75] As an addition to the common accumulation of purported allusions to things Hegel, Wellhausen did mention Ernest Renan's comparison of the Jehovist to the philosopher: cf. Julius Wellhausen, review of *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, Vol. 2, by Ernest Renan, *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 10, no. 14 (1889): 511–12, at 512; see, too, Wellhausen, "Heinrich Ewald," 64, 77.

[76] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 13, cf. also 4, 10. Whereas he let this line remain in all editions of the work, Wellhausen removed a different statement between the

(Though he had first planned to dedicate *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, to Vatke, that honor went, instead, to Ewald: the young admirer apparently fell to disappointment when he saw how much his onetime hero had declined in the forty years since publication of *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*.[77]) "Hegel was the progenitor of Vatke, Vatke of Wellhausen, and Wellhausen of Delitzsch," stated one opponent.[78] While this alleged begotten son did himself acknowledge the philosophical underpinnings of his father's labors, Wellhausen claimed their true conclusions had been reached by other means. Considering the efforts of Strauß and Vatke, he contended, "The authors, good friends, of the two great theological works of the year 1835 were indeed Hegelians. But what is of scientific importance therein does not stem from Hegel."[79] Upon the death of Vatke, he also sent his (biological) son a message with a similar declaration: "Hegelian or not: it is all the same to me – but your blessed father had an admirably true and fine feeling for the individuality of the material (*Sachen*)."[80] Much more than merely offer a defense against genetic

---

first and second: "Vatke's book is the most important contribution ever made to the history of ancient Israel" (idem, *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1 , 4 n. 1). Perlitt suggests the pressure from heavy criticism had compelled him to eliminate this declaration (idem, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 167 n. 4). In a different venue, Wellhausen called Vatke "the finest observer of the Old Testament" (Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., ed. Wellhausen, 172, although this pronouncement appeared in material Wellhausen then cut for the fifth edition).

[77] Cf. Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 28, 1874, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 24–25; Wellhausen to Dillmann, April 20, 1876, in ibid., 34; Wellhausen to Reuß, September 24, 1881, in ibid, 90–91; Wellhausen to Adolf Hilgenfeld, August 29, 1896, in ibid., 199; Wellhausen to Stade, February 27, 1905, in ibid., 447–48; cf. also Smend, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," 444. Having married wealthy, Vatke became a rentier and focused increasingly on music; by 1881, in his letter to Reuß, Wellhausen could pronounce him no longer a Hegelian, already for some time (*ad loc.*).

[78] Martin Kegel, *Away from Wellhausen: A Contribution to the New Orientation in Old Testament Study*, trans. Marian Nolloth (London: Murray, 1924), 23, cf. 19 n. 1 [GO: *Los von Wellhausen! Ein Beitrag zur Neuorientierung in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1923)], referring to this statement as first articulated in an earlier article. In like manner, Pedersen inferred, "Vatke established a line of development for the history of Israel, and so his Hegelian view passes unnoticed into the next theory that was applied to the history of culture, namely, the theory of evolution" (Pedersen, "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," 174). Kegel produced a number of studies on biblical criticism, including one on Bauer and New Testament scholarship: idem, *Bruno Bauer und seine Theorien über die Entstehung des Christentums* (Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte 6; Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1908).

[79] Wellhausen, "Strauß' *Leben Jesu*," 354; cf. also Julius Wellhausen, "Pentateuch and Joshua," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., Vol. 18 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885), 505–14, at 508; Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., ed. Wellhausen, 644. Smend agrees: "This [i. e., the great exegetical, critical, and historical achievement] was not bound to Hegelian philosophy. The scaffolding was torn down, and the construction remained. Indeed, only after the tearing down of the scaffolding could one really see and appreciate the construction" (idem, "De Wette und das Verhältnis zwischen historischer Bibelkritik und philosophischem System im 19. Jahrhundert," 113). He continues, "The emancipation of Vatke's work from Hegelianism was the contribution of *Julius Wellhausen*" (ibid., 114, italics original).

[80] Wellhausen to Theodor Vatke, [late April, 1882,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 99–100. Here, he also reiterated, "I have learned more from no other person, so much from hardly any other, than

fallacies, Wellhausen believed sure judgments on the history of Israel had arisen independently of known philosophical commitments. As with this promoter of Vatke then, so now for Wellhausen's own proponents: the legitimacy of an historical reconstruction apparently demands its autonomy from any philosophy.

A second interpretive crux for determining the relationship of Wellhausen's historical work to Hegel's – or, more properly, Hegelian – philosophy lies in the story he narrated. This more fundamental and evidently still more troubling shackle has drawn perhaps an even greater number of would-be warders and liberators.[81] At bottom, the number three seems to be not only holy but also wholly dubious. Interpreters of Wellhausen have oft discerned a triad of stages in his historiography of Israel, be it from nature through history to law, from primitive worship through ethical consciousness to ceremonial religion, from centralization through ritualization to denaturalization, from folk religion through reform to hierarchical worship, from paganism through prophecy to theocracy, or from state through prophecy to law.[82] The argument then centers on their connection to each another – whether dialectical, degenerative, developmental, or progressive – as well as the operative categories.

Alongside this qualitative question, one of quantity also enters the discussion. A wider scope for Wellhausen's work on the past expands the number of stages in his grander view of history. After all, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* did encompass the dawn of Christianity, which thereby extended his genealogy of

---

from your father" (ibid.). This letter first appeared at the conclusion of a biography on Vatke, dedicated to Theodor: Heinrich Benecke, *Wilhelm Vatke in seinem Leben und seinen Schriften* (Bonn: Strauß, 1883), 627.

[81] William Foxwell Albright thus opined, "In order to catch some glimpse of the underlying historical meaning of the tendency, we must remember that Wellhausenism is a Hegelian structure, which flourished naturally under the conditions of the German Reich but was already alien to the spirit of the Weimar Republic and could be introduced into England and America only by the creation of *ad hoc* ideological patterns which could not last long. To the nationalistic Wellhausen there was something inspiring in the progress of biblical institutions from early Israelite anarchy to national unity and from alleged primitive fetishism to abstract monotheism, which foreshadowed the reign of the Hegelian *Geist*" (idem, "The War in Europe and the Future of Biblical Studies," in *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, ed. Harold R. Willoughby [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947], 162–74, at 172).

[82] So, respectively, Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "Wellhausen and the History of Israel's Religion," in *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, ed. Douglas A. Knight (Semeia 25; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 61–73, at 62–63 [repr. in idem, *Israelite Religion and Biblical Theology: Collected Essays* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 267; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 182–96], cited according to the original publication; Herbert F. Hahn, "Wellhausen's Interpretation of Israel's Religious History: A Reappraisal of His Ruling Ideas," in *Essays on Jewish Life and Thought: Presented in Honor of Salo Wittmayer Baron*, ed. Joseph L. Blau (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), 299–308, at 299; Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, 263–64, 268; Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber*, 262–68; Pedersen, "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," 171–73; Hourani, "Islam and the Philosophers of History," 239–40.

religion even later chronologically – not to mention his subsequent research on the New Testament.[83] Conversely, some writers see less a triad than a duality as the more important feature in the historical work of Wellhausen. The contrast between early and late, natural and developed, primary and secondary functioned, accordingly, as a more powerful force in his analysis and judgment than the presumed phases of change over time. Here, the preference for the primitive in Wellhausen betrayed still deeper roots in romanticism, with Johann Gottfried Herder (1774–1803) an apparently more palatable progenitor for many commentators.[84]

This separation, description, organization, and evaluation of elements within Wellhausen's historiography – based upon the phases of ancient Israel he himself had separated, described, organized, and evaluated – has led some analysts of the analyst to deduce not only a Hegelian substructure in his historical endeavors but also, even incongruently, a properly positivistic or evolutionary one instead. However, these disputes over -ism in Wellhausen – be it Hegelianism, Darwinism, and Comteanism or, more broadly, idealism, evolutionism, and positivism proper – tend to focus solely on the eponyms themselves or on the classic forms of such epistemologies rather than associated questions, answers, theories, and movements, which could diverge substantially from their (dubious or scandalous) origins and originators.[85] Striving to remove him from the apparent dangers

[83] Hence, Levenson sees the gospel as a fourth stage in Wellhausen's thought (idem, *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism*, 12). As Wellhausen himself closed a later article, "Judaism therefore prepared the ground upon which Christianity was based at the outset" (idem, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 38; cf. idem, "Israel," 512–13; idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 370–71).

[84] Thompson writes, for instance, "It is surely no accident that each of the modern investigators – Kraus, Hahn, Perlitt and Smend – have taken us back to one name, and that each of our lines of investigation – whether of evolution, or philosophy, or rationalism – has also pointed to the same name – that of Herder. The critical succession from Wellhausen back to Herder can be established along two lines of parentage. In the one line are Wellhausen, Ewald, Eichhorn and Herder, in the other, Wellhausen, Vatke, de Wette and Herder" (idem, *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf*, 46); so also Barton, "Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*: Influences and Effects," 326–27; but cf. also Boschwitz, *Julius Wellhausen*, 18–33. Similarly, Roland T. Boer contends, "Now we could attribute Wellhausen's venom [for priests and all things priestly] to the forceful stream of Enlightenment anticlericalism or to the Protestant abhorrence of all things papist, but it seems to me that there is another current that flows into these, namely, the curious legacy of the Romanticism that has been so strong in Germany" (Boer, review of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel, with a reprint of the article "Israel" from the* Encyclopaedia Britannica, by Julius Wellhausen, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 124, no. 2 [2005]: 349–54, at 350).

[85] In his superlative history of anthropological thought, George W. Stocking, Jr., has brilliantly dissected the complexity of determining intellectual influences, and one passage in particular pertains especially well to such debates in the history of biblical scholarship, which therefore merits full citation: "We may distinguish, for instance, between what was explicit or directly implied in [*On the*] *Origin* [*of Species*] and the range of metaphysical, moral, or ideological notions deriving from other sources that were intermingled with Darwinism – thereby facilitating the intellectual acceptance of a theory whose implications were for many Victorians quite disorienting, or legitimating social phenomena whose moral basis required buttressing. From this

of philosophical systems or anthropological concepts by placing the scholar safely in the tradition of German historicism, with its more narrow interest in national history and organic unfolding, Perlitt argues, for instance, "Wellhausen needed neither Hegel nor evolutionism (in *sensu stricto*) to have a – clearly only general and never theoretically probed – conception of 'development,'" which proves correct insofar as a number of competing explanations sought to account for change in time.[86] Yet the historian's understanding of a more general pattern for social and anthropological development over time, on the one hand, and a more specific unity of Semitic peoples, on the other, framed his historical work on ancient Israel beyond any strictly internal account. A skeleton stood at the ready upon which he could place the flesh of Israel's ancient past. Furthermore, none of these intellectual traditions, historicism included, remained exempt from philosophical commitments. In his classic monograph on German historiography, Iggers therefore states:

> Nevertheless, German historicism, as a theory of history, possessed many of the characteristics of an ideology. Far from seeing to understand each historical situation from within, the German historians in the national tradition generally committed the sin of which they accused Western historians: imposing concepts or norms on historical reality.[87]

So, too, Robert Oden, writes, "As with the German historiographic tradition generally, what is here remarkable is Wellhausen's condemnation of the theoretical and the abstract on the one hand, and yet his fundamental reliance upon highly theoretical – and theological – abstractions on the other hand."[88] He sharpens the argument even further: "That Wellhausen stands squarely within this tradition is a far more significant conclusion than is the issue of the extent to which he was or

---

point of view, the sociocultural evolutionary teleology of progress may better be thought of as 'Darwinistic' rather than 'Darwinian.' Taking a more narrow textual view … we might look for the questions to which men's ideas were answers. On the one hand, questions raised in prior scientific (or extrascientific) contexts might be 'Darwinized.' On the other hand, Darwinism might raise new questions which had not been relevant in previous contexts. And the answers in both cases might be Darwinian or Darwinistic. From this point of view, the impact of Darwinisim on anthropological speculation becomes much more complex. For just as the anthropological questions to which Darwinism provided answers were not all Darwinian, neither were all the anthropological questions raised by Darwinism answerable in a strictly Darwinian framework. But in the context of the Darwinian debate, some of these questions were nonetheless compelling for all that, and men answered them as best they could. It is therefore necessary to pay close attention to the interplay of questions and answers in the developing Darwinian debate if we would understand its relation to the emergence of sociocultural evolutionism" (idem, *Victorian Anthropology* [New York: Free Press, 1987], 146).

[86] Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 178.

[87] Iggers, *The German Conception of History*, 17. Iggers centers his study on "[t]hree sets of ideas [that] occupy a central role in the theoretical position of the German national tradition of historiography": namely, "a concept of the state, a philosophy of value, and a theory of knowledge" (ibid., 7).

[88] Oden, *The Bible Without Theology*, 23.

was not a Hegelian …."[89] This tradition carried substantial, if unacknowledged, philosophical freight.

The philologist occupied an epistemological space within a deep historical matrix of questions asked, answers generated, theories debated, practices developed, and assumptions naturalized. Instead of a few, limited, super-empirical theoretical structures associated, all too often roughly, with specific personalities that may or may not have potentially shaped his work – and therefore require a disassociation to preserve his results and legacy or an association to subvert them – an epistemological complex enveloped all his undertakings. The question, therefore, is not – or at least not primarily – one of direct philosophical dependency but rather a conception of history and the means of accessing the past that "goes without saying because it comes without saying."[90]

At base, the problem of reconstructing ancient Israel hinged on the narrative itself, whether of degeneration or development. Whereas conservative exegetes followed the biblical text with its claims of a paradise lost, a story of decline, liberal interpreters like Wellhausen diverged (at least in part) from such pretensions. The issue for the latter – which exposed them to any number of charges from the former – then turned to the cause, nature, and distinction of that change in time, with the deity or "history" serving as one possible but not necessary force. At least three faults divided this field of inquiry: particularism vs. universalism, which determined the selection of data and explanation of past phenomena; unity or duplexity, which either divided the universe into spirit and matter and thus demanded discrete historical and natural sciences or united the universe and hence permitted a single scientific method; and polygenesis vs. monogenesis, which featured in the language of independent invention, parallels, logical stages, and psychic unity over and against genealogy, diffusion, borrowing, and variation.[91] (With its emphasis on stages, laws, progress, and similarity, the term evolution as frequently employed in anthropological discussions actually diverged from the standard framework of biology, which stressed environmental influences, adaptation, and dissimilarity.[92]) The choice between and among these

[89] Ibid.

[90] Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 16; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 167.

[91] See further Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology*; Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*; Suzanne Marchand, "Priests among the Pygmies: Wilhelm Schmidt and the Counter-Reformation in Austrian Ethnology," in *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, ed. H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 283–316.

[92] Cf. Jonathan Z. Smith, "Adde Parvum Parvo Magnus Acervus Erit," *History of Religion* 11, no. 1 (1971): 67–90 [repr. in idem, *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1978) and (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 240–64], page numbers accord with the original publication; idem, *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 19–35; idem, "Acknowledgments: Morphology and History in Mircea Eliade's *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (1949–1999), Part 1: The Work

ways of knowing may have been involuntary, indirect, or incomplete, but these conceptual structures structured even the heavily empirical ventures of philological historicism, which demand interrogation. The matter is one of degree as well as kind.

3.4 More Than Mere Empiricism

Largely unconcerned with questions of abstraction, Wellhausen never really occupied himself with rumination on epistemology, at least in any formal, written setting. Ostensibly endorsing this position, Smend affirms, "Wellhausen did not waste his and his readers' time with methodological discussions. His maxim was: 'It does not depend only on the glasses but on the eyes as well.'"[93] Smend, like many other commentators, acknowledges the presence of certain preferences – even crediting the scholar himself for the same acknowledgement – but avoids any association of him with "some ideology or other."[94] Indeed, that bogeyman of theory has lurked around discussion of his scholarship from the very start. Even then, Wellhausen felt compelled to dispel the whiff of Darwin in his *Geschichte Israels*.[95]

Few signs would suggest such concerns have dissipated. While his proponents have expended goodly efforts to release him from the evidently imperiling debts to the non-empirical – be it positivism, idealism, or evolutionism – opponents seem to relish in insisting on dependency, a weapon apparently as powerful for

---

and Its Contexts," *History of Religions* 39, no. 4 (2000): 315–31; idem, "Acknowledgments: Morphology and History in Mircea Eliade's *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (1949–1999), Part 2: The Texture of the Work," *History of Religions* 39, no. 4 (2000): 332–51 [both repr. in idem, *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 61–100]; idem, "The 'End' of Comparison: Redescription and Rectification," in *A Magic Still Dwells: Comparative Religion in the Postmodern Age*, ed. Kimberley C. Patton and Benjamin C. Ray (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 237–41.

[93] Smend, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," 451. The maxim comes from Wellhausen himself: cf. idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6, foreword, viii.

[94] Ibid. However, Smend does describe him as "supremely well-read in philosophy" (idem, "Julius Wellhausen," 102). At university, Wellhausen also took courses on Plato's *Symposium*, symbolism, logic, and metaphysics: cf. Wellhausen, *Briefe*, Appendix 4: "Belegte Lehrveranstaltungen, 1862–1865."

[95] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 366 – a comment that came first with the second edition; cf. also the note omitted from the English translation in idem, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 388 n. 2. On the accusation of Darwinism, see further, e. g., the polemical work by Eduard Rupprecht (1837–1907), which he dedicated to the Princeton conservative William Henry Green (1825–1900), "the head of America's faithful theological Old Testament School," *Des Rätsels Lösung, oder Beiträge zur richtigen Lösung des Pentateuchsrätsels für den christlichen Glauben und die Wissenschaft*, Vol. 2, *Erweis der Echtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit des Pentateuch für die Wissenschaft* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1896), esp. 40, 115–32, as opposed to subsequent defenses by Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 42–52, 80–85, 173–206, and Thompson, *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf*, 35–50.

undermining research on the Bible as it was for challenging claims from the Bible itself amidst the *Babel-Bibel-Streit*. These debates might easily imply the value and legitimacy of his conclusions, his methods, or his legacy stand or fall based on the amount of "theory" in them, as if sheer philological studies were either entirely free of or relatively unaffected by them. In a different venue, Smend assures, for instance, "Wellhausen stood at as great a remove from Hegelian speculation as a German historian of the nineteenth century could without falling right out of context."[96] But as Oden has responded, "Smend's statement is well and carefully put. But the context of which he speaks … is the key to following the course of nineteenth-century biblical criticism."[97] Likewise, Howard writes, "Biblical criticism in the early nineteenth century (and today) was not an autonomous field of gradual scientific accretion, but a time-conditioned enterprise predicated on the attitudes and concerns of a specific cultural environment."[98] The same as Wellhausen's early impression of the law within the Hebrew Bible, which, he believed, "intruded itself uneasily, like a ghost that makes a noise indeed, but is not visible," such presuppositions therefore hovered behind his work: but they differed from that ghost by affecting everything.[99] The issue centers, then, not on whether but which theoretical machinery – presumably widespread across the human sciences – powered and hence directed Wellhausen's practices and pursuits.

With most mid-century historians Wellhausen shared a conception of history along with the proper means of accessing the past. Now, be it to protect or oppose his findings, most of his interpreters do at least pay lip service to such conditioning – calling him a "child of his time," mentioning the phenomenon of historicism, or alluding to coeval work on the ancient world – but few have drawn the fuller analytical implications from such admissions *en passant*, whether deeply, into his theoretical assumptions, or broadly, for comparison with other labors on antiquity.[100] Rather, either simple declaration or surface intimation tends to prevail over detailed demonstration. In this way, Wellhausen's personal aversion to reflection on theory as well as his eschewal of comparative endeavors both find frequent replication in those who study his work. However, in an astute account of how inquiries into the Hebrew Bible and ancient Israel occupied an episte-

[96] Rudolf Smend, "Julius Wellhausen and His *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*," in *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, ed. Knight, 14 [the German manuscript was later published as "Julius Wellhausen und seine Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels," in idem, *Epochen der Bibelkritik* (Gesammelte Studien 3; Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 109. Munich: Kaiser, 1991), 168–85].

[97] Oden, *The Bible Without Theology*, 24.

[98] Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism*, 43. Equally applicable to Wellhausen, he further comments, "one would be hard pressed to extricate de Wette's biblical-critical concerns and methods from their immersion in broader intellectual and historical currents" (ibid., 42).

[99] Wellhausen, P*rolegomena to the History of Israel*, 3.

[100] Biblical scholars like Perlitt, Oden, and Halpern represent the exceptions in their sustained pursuit of these questions, which brings them into the field of inquiry tended by modern historians such as Mangold, Marchand, and Howard.

mological space in the German historiographic tradition – an account that has, unfortunately, not set many trends for the kind of *Forschungsgeschichte* written within the discipline and hence for most research undertaken in the history of biblical and theological scholarship – Oden has stressed their very embeddedness in much larger cultural and intellectual history.[101] To exploit his own concise conclusion, which emerges only on the other side of sustained consideration, "the basic precepts of the German tradition of historical understanding are also the basic precepts out of which Wellhausen composes the history of Israelite religion and literature."[102] As the analysis of these principles that underlay historicism and its philological positivism elucidates the ideas and practices at work in Wellhausen's efforts, so scrutiny of his labors casts light upon those principles in turn – a mutual illumination of general and particular alike.

Since he left so much implicit, epistemological elements prove difficult to discern. In his major study of Wellhausen – an exercise that ultimately aims to free the philologian from idealism, thereby muting the philosophical undertones in historicism, and to rehabilitate him as a theologian – Perlitt has sought to overcome the scarcity of open contemplation. To do so, he finds recourse in peripheral statements across the publications and incidental comments in the private letters of Wellhausen. Its insight notwithstanding, Perlitt's own analysis often recreates a problem inherent in his object of inquiry: Wellhausen could slip between emic and etic perspectives. "Morality is that for the sake of which all other things exist; it is the alone essential thing in the world," he wrote. "It is no postulate, no idea, but at once a necessity and a fact, the most intensely living of personal powers – Jehovah the God of Hosts. In wrath, in ruin, this holy reality makes its existence known; it annihilates all that is hollow and false."[103] With this example, which represents one of any number, Wellhausen may have been portraying the past or expressing his own opinion: the reading could go either way. In similar fashion, Perlitt frequently deploys the words of Wellhausen himself to investigate his values but does so without drawing any clear distinction between statements descriptive and programmatic. For instance, he depicts Wellhausen imagining his own task as historian "to underscore 'simply the historical, only the world-historical' and not to confound the portrayal with the theological reflection on what is portrayed," although Wellhausen had employed this characterization for antique historiography, not as a prescription for the modern kind.[104] Perlitt slides, in consequence, from his author's portrayal of an ancient

[101] See Oden, *The Bible Without Theology*, 1–39; cf. idem, "Intellectual History and the Study of the Bible," in *The Future of Biblical Studies: The Hebrew Scriptures,* ed. R. E. Friedman and H. G. M. Williamson (Semeia Studies; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 1–18.

[102] Oden, *The Bible Without Theology*, 23.

[103] Wellhausen, "Israel," 472; cf. idem, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 23.

[104] Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 217, but cf. 175, the original quote coming from Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, 295. So also Perlitt employs a statement from a Wellhausen essay to assign him a conception of divine revelation as "no hypostasized abstraction" (although a

perspective to a normative reflection on what or how to portray. An imprecision in editorializing makes each a challenge to interpret, Wellhausen as object and Perlitt as analyst.

Nevertheless, Perlitt rightly sets his sights on that unfrequented destination of the philosophical premises in Wellhausen's historiography. To reappropriate a statement by the orientalist himself, originally directed towards writers in the ancient world, "Almost more important to me than the phenomena themselves, are the presuppositions which lie behind them."[105] In addition, Perlitt follows a sure path into the fractures evident in published texts and by the prospects that private letters afford. While Boschwitz charted this course through correspondence, the edition of epistles by Smend, Porzig, and Müller has recently cleared the way, facilitating compensatory insight. However, as with publications in his lifetime, though perhaps to a lesser extent, Wellhausen's dispatches contain interpretive pitfalls insofar as they spanned his whole career, which suggests possible shifts in positions, and further addressed a range of addressees, which entails a larger spectrum of performativity. As one subset of sources, reviews and critiques of other's work offer leverage on those oft concealed – yet not inexistent – theoretical convictions which Wellhausen inherited and transmitted. Although the rules of the positivist game mostly went unspoken, their violation could elicit cries of foul. Such evaluations betray premises. Consequently, historians do have means available to conjure up the ghost of Wellhausen's predications.

First and foremost, with his work on ancient Israel Wellhausen sought to trace a national history, and to that nation he ascribed a distinctive spirit, an individual nature.[106] Although the language of geist appeared primarily (and, indeed, frequently) in his discussion of distinguishable epochs – of a people having changed in time – he did affirm "the peculiar character of the nation" or "national personality."[107] Whereas Moses had "laid the basis of Israel's subsequent peculiar individuality," the prophets – as its products, not creators – intensified

---

missing quotation mark adds confusion to the documentation), whereas the text cited referred more directly not to the author's own conviction but to the conceptual world of the prophets, even if the original text may indeed betray a slippage of its own; in consequence, Perlitt places this historiographic articulation on the same level as the more clearly personal belief that Wellhausen revealed in discussing a work by Smith (Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 232); cf., too, the original comment on ancient philosophy by Wellhausen that Perlitt then excised and applied, absent any hermeneutical qualification, to Wellhausen himself: Wellhausen to Schwartz, January 12, 1913, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 598; Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 233.

[105] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 368.

[106] Much contemporary scholarship on the subject would likely maintain a similar, albeit weaker, form of this conception, beneath the term "culture" or, perhaps less often, "civilization." The German tradition tended to downplay a conception of civilization, especially given its association with "Western" (i. e., French or British) theoretical frameworks of some human universal development and onward march of progress. By contrast, the term "culture" in German parlance had the propensity to imply not a separate *Volk* but the achievements of human art and intellect.

[107] Wellhausen, "Israel," 432.

this national character, whose integrity endured despite interaction with foreign peoples.[108] Furthermore, Israel itself had an awareness of this individuality (and unity), one consolidated by the monarchy and heightened by intercourse with other nations.[109] Wellhausen located said national spirit in religion, which he called "the driving force of [its] history" and "the basis, the informing principle, the implied postulate of their national consciousness."[110] With national and religious histories thus mapped onto one another, he considered how "the Israelite religion worked its way upwards out of paganism," which he believed to be "the content of its history."[111] Now, if this ascription to ancient Israel of some distinctive soul undergirded Wellhausen's work on its past, the premise of individuality for nations characterized much German historiography at the time. Iggers paints a nice portrait of this view: "The world of man is in a state of incessant flux, although within it there are centers of stability (personalities, institutions, nations, epochs), each possessing an inner structure, a character, and each in constant metamorphosis in accord with its own internal principles of development."[112] Wellhausen sought to grasp the soul of a nation as its unfolded over time.[113] Such a postulate then guided his pursuits.

Next, Wellhausen searched for the spirit of that nation in its cultural productions, most of all in texts. Though he did not bedizen his studies with the more

---

[108] Ibid., 438, 432, 433.

[109] Ibid., 432, 457.

[110] Ibid., *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 33; idem, "Israel," 434; cf. pp. 86–94 above.

[111] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 32.

[112] Iggers, *The German Conception of History*, 5; see, more broadly, Matti Bunzl, "Franz Boas and the Humboldtian Tradition: From *Volksgeist* and *Nationalcharakter* to an Anthropological Concept of Culture," in *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. (History of Anthropology 8; Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 17–78; Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*.

[113] Already Max Weber (1864–1920) described Wellhausen's approach to history – with its focus on the gradual unfolding of some intrinsic potentiality – as "immanent evolutionary," further attributing this stance to certain religious beliefs (idem, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, Vol. 3, *Das antike Judentum* [Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1921], 2–3 n. 1; cf. also Rogerson, *Anthropology and the Old Testament*, 22–45). In a rather disapproving essay, Albright advanced a similar claim: "To Wellhausen the fully developed religion of Israel was latent in its earlier stages, spirit and law replacing nature and primitive freedom from fixed norms," although he ascribed this approach to Hegelianism (idem, "The Ancient Near East and the Religion of Israel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 59, no. 2 [1940]: 85–112, at 93). Elsewhere, he contended, "When transplanted to the positivistic liberal atmosphere of Victorian England and to the sociologism and instrumental pragmatism of America, Wellhausenism proved an essentially refractory foreign body. To be sure, both British and Americans welcomed the evolutionary idea, which was thoroughly congenial to the intellectual atmosphere of the late nineteenth century. But the notion of an evolution by Hegelian dialectic from concrete unity to abstract unity remained totally foreign to English-speaking thought, which has never been hospitable to any form of Hegelianism. So the general acceptance of Wellhausenism in English-speaking lands has provided the best means by which to insure the extinction of Old Testament studies in liberal Protestant institutions" (idem, "The War in Europe and the Future of Biblical Studies," 172–73).

overtly idealist phraseology of geist and objectifications, such a premise lay in the foundation of his thought. More than a path to the past, texts actually materialized a nation's very soul. In fact, Peter Machinist more or less discerns the same principle from a different angle, namely, Wellhausen's stance towards assyriology. With his typically meticulous analysis, Machinist delivers an excellent study of the scholar's complex reluctance to engage these non-biblical materials for exploration of ancient Israel and in doing so uncovers a crucial principle at work:

> What was at stake, in all of this, was above all the internal analysis of master texts – the texts that the ancients themselves, at least in the judgment of 18th and 19th[-cent.] European scholarship, considered the major windows on their histories and cultures. […] For it was in these master texts more than anywhere else, the assumption was, that the particular distinctiveness, the special genius, could be seen of the cultures from which the texts came.[114]

This assumption of a national spirit externalized in artifacts hence directed Wellhausen when he chose the data to scrutinize. In his classic account of German science at the time, Ringer, too, encapsulates this rather standard position, which undoubtedly applies to Wellhausen as well: "In being past-minded, the scholar never abstracts from the historical context which he seeks to understand, as it were, 'from within.' He treats the culture and the whole 'spirit' of a given epoch as a unique and self-contained complex of values and ideas."[115] With the same commitment to analysis "from within," Wellhausen sought to isolate a people, distinguish its epochs, and separate the texts produced in each – although these three operations oft became entangled.

However, the premise also underwrote exclusions. Such belief in an essence that developed over time – and became manifest accordingly – supported a preference for the artifacts examined (texts) but carried further implications not only for the explanation of historical phenomena (internal rather than external causation) but also for the chronological parameters of study (the "life" of the nation itself) and the analytical priority of material (productions created and transmitted by the nation, less those of other cultures). The philologist showed a skepticism toward pressing the history of Israel into an all too distant past, stating, "The history of a people cannot be taken beyond the people itself, into a period when it still did not exist."[116] If he cast doubt on what had come before,

---

[114] Machinist, "The Road Not Taken," 501. When Machinist wrote his essay, the full edition of Wellhausen's letters had not been published, although some had already appeared in other venues and Smend shared then unpublished correspondence with him (cf. ibid., 474 n. 10, 490, n. 54, cf. 471 n. 4). For Wellhausen's stance toward assyriology, cf. Wellhausen to Kuenen, December 18, 1875, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 33–34; Wellhausen to Althoff, March 8, 1892, in ibid., 278–79; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, December 16, 1894, in ibid., 325; Wellhausen to Bevan, August 17, 1903, in ibid., 423–24; Wellhausen to Nöldeke, January 5, 1914, in ibid., 613. As with cuneiform, Wellhausen had similar misgivings on the relevance of egyptology: cf., inter alia, idem, "Israel," 440, 430 n. 1.

[115] Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins*, 99.

[116] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 10. This line opened the volume.

Wellhausen also had suspicions of what occurred outside. True, he did find fault with Duhm for underplaying the external stimulus of the Assyrian Empire for the rise of prophecy – though in doing so still contended, "The inner potential may contribute the most to explanation of the phenomenon" – and did suggest both physical geography and modes of life affected the course of development.[117] But Wellhausen set limits on the hunt for origins, placing boundaries on the length of temporal distance, the span of generations within a nation's past, and the extent of cross-cultural diffusion relevant for historical understanding. In a critique of one such venture, he ultimately judged, " … where this material originally comes from is methodologically irrelevant altogether."[118] He called into question the interpretive power of probes into the deeper history of tradition.

The diachronic, synchronic, and comparative scope thus narrowed for investigation, this postulate of a nation's personality gradually unfolding over time and externalized in texts governed Wellhausen's analysis of literature – and thereby his reconstruction of the past. As the geist went, so went its objectifications. If a spirit became manifest in texts, the logic held, then changes in that nation yielded concomitant change in its productions. For this reason, Wellhausen fixed his gaze on a particular people in its discrete epochs and on the specific texts produced by that people in each respective stage.[119] As he himself asserted,

> Under the influence of the spirit of each successive age, traditions originally derived from one source were very variously apprehended and shaped; one way in the ninth and eight centuries, another way in the seventh and sixth, and yet another in the fifth and fourth. Now, the strata of the tradition show the same arrangement as do those of the legislation. And here it makes no difference whether the tradition be legendary or historical, whether it relates to pre-historic or to historic times; the change in the prevailing ideas shows itself equally in either case.[120]

While Wellhausen discerned a different shaping with each epoch, he also saw a diversity in the preservation – in the extant evidence – of these larger qualitative changes across the Hebrew Bible. He noted, for instance, Chronicles not superseding but existing next to Judges, Samuel, and Kings, which themselves had undergone accretions.[121] So, too, he perceived in the Samson legends "two

[117] Wellhausen, review of *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion dargestellt*, by Duhm, 153. For other instances of external factors on the development of ancient Israel, see idem, "Israel," 456–57, 476; idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 20, 24, 139–40, 234.

[118] Julius Wellhausen, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur," 233. On this critique of Gunkel and the nature of their exchange, see Paul Michael Kurtz, "Waiting at Nemi: Wellhausen, Gunkel, and the World Behind Their Work," *Harvard Theological Review* 109, no. 4 (2016): 567–85.

[119] Thus, he leveled criticism at Renan for not holding to this method: so Julius Wellhausen, review *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, Vol. 3, by Ernest Renan, *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 12, no. 17 (1891): 628–29.

[120] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 171, cf. also 141, 152, 293–94.

[121] Ibid., 228. As he described, "More frequently the new forces have not caused the old root to send forth a new stock, or even so much as a complete branch; they have only nourished par-

souls united, as it were, in one body."[122] Although Wellhausen could, on occasion, display a certain amount of modesty at the prospect of disentangling the composition history of the biblical literature, he did so with great tenacity.

Now, specific suppositions helped direct his operation. "Only it may stand as a general principle," he submitted, "that the nearer history is to its origin the more profane it is. In the pre-Deuteronomic narratives, the difference is to be recognised less in the *kind* of piety than in the *degree* of it."[123] Instead of leaving his untangled textual threads simply lying on the floor, the philologist in him sought to group them back together.[124] In a different article composed for *Encyclopædia Britannica*, which included a lucid review of biblical criticism, he declared, accordingly:

> Here too analysis does not exhaust the task of the critic; a subsequent synthesis is required. When he has separated out the individual documents the critic has still to examine their mutual relations, to comprehend them as phases in a living process, and in this way to track the gradual development of the Hebrew historical tradition.[125]

Having selected written sources derived from the nation itself, Wellhausen dissected that literature into constituent parts and assigned those parts to particular epochs. The synchronic enterprise of inspecting ancient texts then gave way to a diachronic program of placing them in succession.

Wellhausen could therefore move from a reconstruction of literature to a reconstruction of the past. The correlation of stages in composition history to those of a nation's history followed from the premise – articulated especially well amidst discussion of legislative developments – that textual strata "grew out of an historical process and characterize their stages."[126] If a textual artifact corresponded to the spirit that produced it at a certain point in time and if the different qualities of texts preserved in a larger corpus accorded with different qualities of the people – presumably from different epochs – then the sequencing of texts implied a sequencing of the nation's own development. Describing no longer a

---

asitic grows; the earlier narratives have become clothed with minor and dependent additions" (ibid.).

[122] Ibid., 245; cf., inter alia, ibid., 182.

[123] Ibid., italics original.

[124] See further R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*, repr. ed. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 53; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 20–31, esp. 22; John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), esp. 283–96.

[125] Wellhausen, "Pentateuch and Joshua," 512. Whybray has historicized this endeavor: "The idea of four successive documents, J, E, D and P, each representing a distinct stage in the development of Israel's religious notions, and of their successive incorporation, step by step, to form a single work was a reflection of nineteenth-century concepts of cultural and religious development" (idem, *The Making of the Pentateuch*, 91).

[126] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 15.

history of literature but history as literature, Wellhausen marked the path that would lead from criticism to construction:

> Critical analysis made steady progress, but the work of synthesis did not hold even pace with it; this part of the problem was treated rather slightly, and merely by the way. Indeed, the true scope of the problem was not realized; it was not seen that most important historical questions were involved as well as questions merely literary, and that to assign the true order of the different strata of the Pentateuch was equivalent to a reconstruction of the history of Israel.[127]

The arrangement of cultural productions – namely, textual activities – in a chronological series could reveal changes in the nation itself precisely because those productions supposedly embodied a national soul, one internally consistent at a given moment. Recapitulating his assignment, Wellhausen therefore argued, "There are in the Pentateuch three strata of law and three strata of tradition, and the problem is to place them in their true historical order."[128]

The problem did not prove insurmountable. As asserted by this dissector of sources, "On the whole it is easy here to bring the successive strata of the Pentateuch into co-ordination with the recognisable steps of the historical development."[129] Wellhausen affirmed the necessity of pegging this succession "by reference to an independent standard, namely, the inner development of the history of Israel so far as that is known to us by trustworthy testimony, from independent sources."[130] Yet "independent sources" meant other biblical texts. Reconstruction of the national past depended on the reconstruction of literary histories within a corpus, which itself depended on the reconstruction of other literary histories in that same corpus. Furthermore, instead of strict procedure from a known literary history to an unknown past of ancient Israel or from a known past of ancient Israel to an unknown literary history, the operation promoted a mutual reinforcement of conceptions about the development of human

---

[127] Wellhausen, "Pentateuch and Joshua," 508; cf. also idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 10–13. Aly Elrefaei stresses this point of a literary history turned a national one, although his analysis of Wellhausen depends heavily on those of other commentators – his real interest clearly lying in Yehezkel Kaufmann (1889–1963): cf. idem, *Wellhausen and Kaufmann: Ancient Israel and Its Religious History in the Works of Julius Wellhausen and Yehezkel Kaufmann*, with a preface by Reinhard G. Kratz (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 490; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 25–44.

[128] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 366. This passage did not appear in the original *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, but came first with the second edition. Summarizing the procedure, he elaborated, "After laboriously collecting the data offered by the historical and prophetical books, we constructed a sketch of the Israelite history of worship; we then compared the Pentateuch with this sketch, and recognised that one element of the Pentateuch bore a definite relation to this phase of the history of worship, and another element of the Pentateuch to that phase of it" (ibid., 367).

[129] Ibid., 141, cf. also 17, 360, 362.

[130] Ibid., 12. As Oden comments, this methodological assumption "was self-evident *only* to those who stood squarely within a particular tradition of historical understanding – the tradition of Humboldt, Ranke, and Droysen" (Oden, *The Bible Without Theology*, 22).

society and textual strata alike. Though Wellhausen might have contended in this instance – as he did for textual criticism – "One can also operate with double-edged knives without danger so long as he knows that they are double-edged and uses them carefully," he showed little awareness of, let alone care with, his social or anthropological assumptions.[131]

If Wellhausen upheld the notion of a distinct national soul for ancient Israel, he also conceived of a fixed course for human development. Reviewing a work on its earliest religion, he maintained, "There was, however, a development from a stage where the people was the subject of the religion to a later one where it became the individual."[132] Wellhausen continued from this same premise when writing on ancient Christianity: "The gospel stands in this respect, as in others, on the level (*Boden*) of the contemporaneous Pharisaic Judaism. It presupposes the development by which the focus of religion, in contrast to the Old Testament, is transferred from the people to the individual and faith or hope from this world to the next."[133] Yet rather than some simple declaration of organic growth or genealogy, that is, historical connection, these statements proceeded from a still more basic understanding of anthropology.[134] He reconstructed the particular against an *a priori* universal. Implicit as it may have been within his reconstructions' structure – and implied it was, indeed, for his explorations of pre-Islamic Arabs and ancient Semites overall – this conceptualization saw cultures develop in accordance with their own internal essence but always in reference to a set morphological pattern.[135] "With the Hebrews, as with the whole ancient world," he announced, "sacrifice constituted the main part of worship. The question is whether their worship did not also in this most important respect pass through a history the stages of which are reflected in the Pentateuch."[136] Wellhausen answered this question in the affirmative: united, the national and literary paths of ancient Israel ran together through a series of stages – stages common to humanity.

---

[131] Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 4, but cf. xiii. He made a similar claim elsewhere: cf. Wellhausen, review of *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, by Smith, 541.

[132] Julius Wellhausen, review of *Der Ahnenkultus und die Urreligion Israels*, by Carl Grüneisen, *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 21, no. 20 (1900): 1301–03, at 1302.

[133] He continued, "The height to which the Jews arduously worked themselves upwards out of their older tradition now turns into the foundation; into the foundation of a new religion. And this foundation achieves a tremendous power and capacity through the resurrection of Jesus" (Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1st ed., 102, cf. also 113–15).

[134] For the concept of organism in reconstructions of ancient Israelite society, see Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 16, 71–85, 173–85; Karolina De Valerio, *Altes Testament und Judentum im Frühwerk Rudolf Bultmanns* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 71; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 55–65; Oden, "Intellectual History and the Study of the Bible."

[135] Cf. pp. 109–13 supra.

[136] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 52.

As for the sequence of those stages, it conformed, in his assessment, to "the recognisable steps of historical development." However, said steps were recognizable precisely because they were given.[137] They and their criteria for ordering came from elsewhere. If not arrested along the way, so went this reasoning, cultures over time transmuted from familial to statist organization, advanced from concrete to abstract thought, and converted from collectivism to individualism – no matter how distinctive any one people might be. Wellhausen seemed to slip from re-describing the past as portrayed by ancient texts to betraying the course of history that he himself perceived when he affirmed, "But on the whole the process of history, although to appearance rougher and more perplexed, is nevertheless in reality much more intelligible, and though seemingly more broken up, actually advances more continuously. There is an ascent upward to the monarchy, not a descent from the splendid times of Moses and Joshua" – a notion that directed him in judging which sources would prove the most ancient and hence the most reliable.[138] Conversely, the orientalist articulated a classic formulation of primitivity:

> They [sc. the Beduin] are still today as they were in ancient times, not because they are incapable of development but because they are arrested at primitive conditions by the desert. For this reason they are so informative; they preserve the prehistorical type of a race destined for history, whose nobility they in particular reveal the most markedly, despite the many nasty traits with which hardship has imprinted on them ….[139]

So, too, he left unaltered in all iterations of his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* the revealing declaration, "The stages of religion, like the stages of history in general, persist alongside one another."[140] Accordingly, the past also lived on into the present.

The premise could permit comparison. Rather than one of semiticity – i. e., the genetic class of "Semites" – the principles of primitivity and internality provided the rationale for this collation of evidence. As averse as he often was to stronger forms of the comparative enterprise, Wellhausen did allow a juxtaposition of

---

[137] Ibid., 141.

[138] Ibid., 235.

[139] Wellhausen, review of *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, by Charles M. Doughty, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 45 (1891): 172–80, at 176. However, Wellhausen criticized the tendency of a different author "to consider the current state of affairs for ursemitism and to correct the results of research on antiquity accordingly" (Julius Wellhausen, review of *Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients*, by Samuel Ives Curtiss, with a foreword by Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 166, no. 4 [1904]: 351–52, at 352, although Wellhausen's review listed the author as "J. S. Curtiss" [English Original: *Primitive Semitic Religion Today: A Record of Researches, Discoveries and Studies in Syria, Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*, with an appendix by William Hayes Ward (Chicago: Revell, [1902])]); cf. also Julius Wellhausen, review of *Coutumes des Arabes au Pays de Moab*, by Antonin Jaussen, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 33, no. 20 (1908): 553–54.

[140] The statement closed his chapter entitled "Das Evangelium."

diachronic data from within a given tradition (whether national, religious, or other) and asynchronic data across traditions so long as they connected to the same stage of development. For this reason, he offered a (rare) methodological reflection on such procedures: "… the stages of one and the same religion correspond, to a certain degree, to the types (*Arten*) of different (*verschiedener*) religions. Comparison of the phases that follow one another is therefore just as instructive as comparison of the types that stand next to one another, and it has the advantage of not treating the fluid as fixed."[141] In the end, this historiographer painted vibrant portraits of ancient cultures, but he colored inside the lines of human development that had already lain before him.

Notwithstanding, Wellhausen did not see passage through these stages as entirely predictable. He hence admitted difficulty in ascertaining the exact cause of divergence in the fate of Israel and that of other peoples, especially related Hebrew ones. In his mature presentation of ancient Israelite and Jewish history, he posed the problem most pointedly: "Why the Israelite history led from a roughly similar beginning to a completely different outcome as the Moabite one cannot ultimately be explained. Nonetheless, a series of transitions can be described in which the path from paganism up to rational worship, in spirit and in truth, was traveled."[142] Wellhausen proceeded to paint an historical portrait of this distinctive people against the background of a scheme for human social and cultural development, one visible at certain points in his subjunctive ruminations. Betraying a framework similar to that which supported his statement on contemporary Beduin, he contended,

> Had the Israelites remained in the wilderness and in barbarism, the historical development they subsequently reached would hardly have been possible; their career would have been like that of Amalek, or, at best, like those of Edom, Moab, and Ammon. Their acceptance of civilisation was undoubtedly a step in the forward direction; but as certainly did it also involve a peril. It involved an overloading, as it were, of the system with materials which

[141] Wellhausen, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 2, cf. also 13–14.

[142] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 33; idem, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 2; see also pp. 90–92 supra. So Pedersen proposes, "In the renderings of Israel's religion by the past generations, Israel is cast as a people that first lived in 'Paganism,' in incoherent superstition and a lack of culture, only to raise itself later by the prophets to religion, that is, to certain universal truths, whether one speaks like Wellhausen, in connection with the old rationalism, of a rational worship in spirit and in truth over against Paganism or one employs, as more commonly happens, the inherited designation 'revelation.' What was adopted from Lessing and the 18th cent. in general as an inheritance of the past is, as already indicated, continued in these renderings through the 19th cent. More or less consciously, the old perception of Israel as the ideal people, bearers of religion, is preserved, but it is allowed to reach this honor through upbringing or development; at the same time, something completely new is introduced into this fairly traditional perception insofar as everything is transferred onto the prophets. In this way, scholarship was able to render a portrait of Israel that was fully satisfying to the time since this foundational idea harmonized with the 19th-cent. conception of the great personality and the genius as creator of all culture" (Pedersen, "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," 180).

it was incapable of assimilating at once. The material tasks imposed threatened to destroy the religious basis of the old national life.[143]

Circumstance could, to some extent, therefore help or hinder a people's progression through universal stages of development, on the one hand, and an unfolding of its own individual spirit, on the other. But difference demanded explanation.

Despite an expression of skepticism for establishing causation, Wellhausen did offer some suggestions as to how – or rather by what or whom – Israel was guided upward on that causeway of a rational, individual, and ethical religion. Although, in his account, the external contingencies of events as well as the more stable factors of environmental setting could affect the still more powerful internal character of a nation as its individuality unrolled within the bounds of fixed social and cultural stages, an explanation of Israel's religion required yet another agent: divine providence. For Wellhausen, morality distinguished and directed that history. In assessing a work on Semitic religion, he addressed the issue of divergence between Israel and Moab: "In my opinion, it does not come down simply and not chiefly to the fact that the God of Israel was always only one. […] It depends much more on the content of the concept of Yahweh. […] And only with the Yahweh of the prophets can one truly speak of monotheism; for the value of monotheism consists solely in the belief: *all power is moral*."[144] Here, he invoked the Scottish philosopher Thomas Carlyle (1795–1881), a major theorist in morality and heroism – one who also featured in his private correspondence.[145] If a moral consciousness individuated Israel, its origins still needed illumination.

---

[143] Wellhausen, "Israel," 447. The English translation of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* employs the term "civilization" rather than Wellhausen's own "culture," a substantial distinction for later germanophone anthropology. Similarly, the historian recounted how ancient Israelites "advanced" from a "pastoral stage" to the agricultural one – which he called a "momentous inner transformation" – and employed the freighted term *Kulturvolk* (idem, "Israel," 446; idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 46). On Wellhausen's concept of culture, especially over against that of Burckhardt, cf. Boschwitz, *Julius Wellhausen*, 74–78.

[144] Wellhausen, review of *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte,* by Baethgen, 1321, italics original. Remarkably – and perhaps discordantly – Wellhausen could criticize theological importations into historical explorations: "As for the question regarding the historical presuppositions of Mosaism, there generally underlies it a misunderstanding arising out of theological intellectualism – an attribute found with special frequency among non-theologians. Moses gave no new idea of God to his people. The question whence he could have derived it therefore need not be raised" (idem, "Israel," 440).

[145] The larger passage from Carlyle merits reproduction: "Such recognition of Nature one finds to be the chief element of Paganism: recognition of Man, and his Moral Duty, though this too is not wanting, comes to be the chief element only in purer forms of religion. Here, indeed, is a great distinction and epoch in Human Beliefs; a great landmark in the religious development of Mankind. Man first puts himself in relation with Nature and her Powers, wonders and worships over those; not till a later epoch does he discern that all Power is Moral, that the grand point is the distinction for him of Good and Evil, of *Thou shalt* and *Thou shalt not*" (Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History* [London: Chapman and Hall, 1840], 28); on the prominence of Carlyle among German Protestant biblical scholars, especially in

This onetime theologian considered the emergence of ethics in ancient Israel less the result of an inbreak from without than an outbreak of a quality already inherent in its own national character, one triggered by the prophets. To deploy his own description of the impetus, he argued:

> Thus, although the prophets were far from originating a new conception of God, they none the less were the founders of what has been called 'ethical monotheism.' But with them this ethical monotheism was no product of the 'self-evolution of dogma,' but a progressive step which had been called forth simply by the course of events.[146]

At first sight, Wellhausen seemed to advance a naturalistic account, whereby a combination of events and circumstance activated an innate potential. However, he immediately attributed the felicitous arrangement of said simple course of events to yet a greater force, a cause of the cause that caused the rise of moral consciousness:

> The providence of God brought it about that this call came at an opportune period, and not too suddenly. The downfall of the nation did not take place until the truths and precepts of religion were already strong enough to be able to live on alone; to the prophets belongs the merit of having recognised the independence of these, and of having secured perpetuity

---

their interpretation of Jesus, see Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 49–52. For reference to Carlyle in Wellhausen's correspondence, see Wellhausen to Kuenen, [March 5, 1879,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 58; Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 9, 1879, in ibid., 59–60; Wellhausen to Smith, [August/September 1881?,] in ibid., 89; Wellhausen to Smith, [October 1881,] in ibid., 93, 95; Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, [December 1883?,] in ibid., 136; Wellhausen to Smith, January 4, 1889, in ibid., 223–24; Wellhausen to Smith, May 1, 1889, in ibid., 226–27.

[146] Wellhausen, "Israel," 474. Based on the German versions of this article, which employed the phrase *Selbstbewegung des Dogmas*, Wellhausen's "self-evolution of dogma" may have been an attempted allusion to Baur, who had deployed such philosophical language when he contended, "… the motion of dogma (*Bewegung des Dogma*) is nothing other than the self-motion of the spirit (*Selbstbewegung des Geistes*), which has both its objective and subjective side in the dogma in which it becomes itself objective," and did so even more elaborately in his discussion of methodology: "The true method can only be the motion immanent in the material (*Sache*) or the concept that moves itself. Yet the self-motion of the concept (*Selbstbewegung des Begriffs*) is the self-motion of the spirit (*Selbstbewegung des Geistes*) insofar as the activity or motion of the spirit (*Bewegung des Geistes*) is thinking (*Denken*). For this reason we must go back to the essence of the intellect who thinks to grasp the dogma in its conception" (Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Vorlesungen über die christliche Dogmengeschichte*, Vol. 1, *Das Dogma der alten Kirche*, Part 1, *Von der apostolischen Zeit bis zur Synode in Nicäa*, ed. Ferdinand Friedrich Baur [Leipzig: Fues (Reisland), 1865], 73, 49, cf. also 43, 172); see Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels* (Greifswald: printed privately, 1880) [repr. in idem, *Grundrisse zum Alten Testament,* ed. Rudolf Smend (Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert, Altes Testament, 27; Munich: Kaiser, 1965), 13–64], 49, cited according to the reprint; idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 1.1, *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's*, 50. In this second instance, Wellhausen included a new line: "Consequently, also the progress that these prophets signify proceeds not from the self-motion of dogma but from the dialectic of the events (*der Dialektik der Begebenheiten*). Only it did not take place on its own: the prophets accomplished it" (*ad loc.*; cf. idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 108).

to Israel by refusing to allow the conception of Jehovah to be involved in the ruin of the kingdom. They saved faith by destroying illusion.[147]

The historiographer cast neither serendipity nor accident but providence in this role of catalyst, though it was a supporting one. Indeed, he envisioned the deity at work in national history. Hence came his declaration, "Now we must acknowledge that the nation is more certainly created by God than the Church, and that God works more powerfully in the history of the nations than in Church history. […] We cannot create for ourselves our sphere of life and action; better that it should be a natural one, given by God."[148] While morality set ancient Israel apart, an ostensibly chance concurrence of natural, fortuitous factors resulted in its generation and consummation, and yet a somewhat ambiguous providence oversaw their concurrence. A god stood somewhere in the background of history. If Wellhausen caught a glimpse of the divine hand subtly drawing out an aptitude within the character of Israel – namely, the ethical dimension – he saw the same force acting elsewhere in the past, albeit by another name: history itself.

Wellhausen thus believed in an objective force that operated throughout all time and space. Sometimes in his writing, this agent could appear under the guise of God, as with his explanation of the impulse to events that then yielded morality or his conviction of divine involvement in the course of nations; at other times, however, he could also ascribe metaphysical qualities to "history," which seemed to serve as a substitute for the deity. Some statements were oblique. Writing on the book of Amos, for example, the philologist re-described the text's perspective and may have slipped into his own: "Everywhere he considers only the fate of the entire people and in doing so distinguishes between just and unjust as little as history itself."[149] With a passage similar in content but different in location, he also opined, "History does not take into account good will, certainly not persons, but deeds; it does not confine the consequences of the deed to the doer; it punishes follies and weakness more severely than sin; it does not undo any act and has no regard for the changed disposition of the heart …."[150] Though certainly suggestive, neither instance proves necessarily indicative of his own position. Yet two other comments in particular do seem to betray Wellhausen's own understanding of history as a force – one equatable with providence and therefore revelation. In an extended discussion of historical perception among the prophets as well as Jesus, he delineated, with apparent approval, an equation of divine activity with the course of developments past and present, on the one

147 Wellhausen, "Israel," 474.

148 Ibid., 513; cf. pp. 308–09 below.

149 Julius Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 5, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt* (Berlin: Reimer, 1892), 93. In a subsequent comment, he also opposed "the god of wishes" to the "god of historical necessity" (ibid., 94).

150 Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 110.

hand, and an identification of said revelation in and as history by the individual, on the other:

> The element in which the prophets live is the storm of the world's history, which sweeps away human institutions; in which the rubbish of past generations with the houses built on it begins to shake, and that foundation alone remains firm, which needs no support but itself. When the earth trembles and seems to be passing away, then they triumph because Jehovah alone is exalted. […] It belongs to the notion of prophecy, of true revelation, that Jehovah, overlooking all the media of ordinances and institutions, communicates Himself to the *individual*, the called one, in whom that mysterious and irreducible rapport in which the deity stands with man clothes himself with energy. Apart from the prophet, *in abstracto*, there is no revelation; it lives in his divine-human ego. This gives rise to a synthesis of apparent contradictions: the subjective in the highest sense, which is exalted above all ordinances, is the truly objective, the divine. This proves itself to be by the consent of the conscience of all, on which the prophets count, just as Jesus does in the Gospel of John, in spite of all their polemic against the traditional religion. They are not saying anything new: they are only proclaiming old truth.[151]

This old truth, the correspondence of revelation and history perceived by the individual, remained a lasting one for Wellhausen. For this reason, he asserted in yet another perspectival slippage, "It is their [sc., the prophets'] contribution that history, not the past but the present one, was understood as the meaningful product of divine dealings."[152] Rather than an empty space, a theatre in which events continually unfolded, Wellhausen saw history itself as a force that acted on those events themselves.[153] Be it under the guise of revelation, history, or providence, this objective cause impacted ancient Israel as the nation realized its inner character over time, passing through universal stages of development in the process.

The very year that Wellhausen was compelled to speak in the foreign tongue of philosophy with Cohen and Herrmann, in 1907, his own native language of historicist philology was also translated into the same – though here too against his will. In the first issue of the *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik*, the classicist Diels – Mommsen's successor as secretary of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences at Berlin – published an article on the unity of science.[154] Having just alluded to the luminaries Mommsen and Hermann von Helmholtz (1821–1894) to describe a recent era in which two good friends and even greater academicians could still not quite overcome the gap between the natural and human sciences to understand each other's work, he juxtaposed quotations by noted electrophysiologist Emil du Bois-Reymond (1818–1896) and

---

[151] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 398, emphasis original.

[152] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 103.

[153] Likewise, Perlitt foregrounds the convergences of history and revelation in Wellhausen: see idem, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 229–43.

[154] Hermann Diels, "Die Einheitsbestrebungen der Wissenschaft," *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 1 (1907): 3–10.

none other than Wellhausen himself to demonstrate a fundamental opposition in conceptions of history: more specifically, whether it lay in the realm of nature or that of the human. Diels placed a statement by the physiologist, "Natural science is the absolute organ of culture[,] and the history of natural science is the actual history of humanity," against a claim by the philologist, "History is the history of the society, of the constitution and of the law, of the economy, of the ruling ideas of morality, of art and science."[155] He thus cast in sharp relief a pair of "categorical" assertions, one by the man of science, another by the man of letters. The author proceeded to announce a new era of interaction between the sciences natural and human, one that would eclipse such a past one of artificial separation. Wellhausen disapproved. In correspondence with Harnack, who had himself contributed an article to the journal issue at issue, this orientalist insisted, "There, I am not speaking categorically at all but stating a fact that is not agreeable to me. I want to move the individual spiritual life (*das individuelle Geistesleben*) away from the 'laws' of history and of statistics."[156] The unwitting representative of the humanities felt he had been misrepresented as the spokesman of a polarized epistemological position.

As for this quote composed by Wellhausen and commandeered by Diels, it had materialized in *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*. In fact, it featured at the very end – that is, once the author had relocated his chapter on the gospel to serve as the conclusion of the work. The larger passage merits full citation:

> Yahwism and Islam teach what powerful influence religion can exert on culture; the Catholic Church of the medieval period, which transferred the rest of the inheritance from antiquity on the German peoples, teaches the same. There is a propensity today to judge

[155] Ibid., 5. However, du Bois-Reymond had constructed this formulation as a modification to Hegel's description of horse and steel as the "absolute organs" by which power was to be produced. The original quotation came from his lecture titled "Culturgeschichte und Naturwissenschaft," which was first printed in the *Deutsche Rundschau* 13 (1877): 214–50, reprinted independently as *Culturgeschichte und Naturwissenschaft. Vortrag gehalten am 24. März 1877 im Verein für wissenschaftliche Vorlesungen zu Köln*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Veit & Comp., 1878), and then issued again in idem, *Reden*, Vol. 1, *Litteratur, Philosophie, Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig: Veit & Comp., 1886), 240–306, at 271.

[156] Wellhausen to Harnack, May 26, 1907, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 517–18, at 518. Continuing, he wrote, "Diels is a good shoemaker, but he should stick to his last. Such a misunderstanding is an impermissible stupidity (*Dummheit*). Clearly when the class[ical] philologists philosophize, they do not all do better than Diels ordinarily, even if they are more ingenious" (ibid.). At this time, the meaning of statistics in German appertained directly to the operations of the state: cf. "Statistik," in *Brockhaus' Konversaktions-Lexikon*, 15th ed., Vol. 15, *Social–Türken* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1895), 265–67. The English cognate betrays a similar history, as Bernard Cohn has observed with his study of colonialism in India, noting, "In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the term 'statistical' did not imply as it does today the collection, aggregation, and presentation of numerical data, rather it implied collection of information thought necessary and useful to the state" (idem, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* [Princeton Studies in Culture/Power/History; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996], 80–81).

religion based upon this influence, be it salutary, be it harmful. The view is directed at the form (*Gattung*) and on the effect of impersonal, epidemic powers. History is the history of the state and of the society, of the constitution and of the law, of the economy, of the ruling ideas, of morality, of art and science. Completely explainable; for only this domain is subject to development, only there is progress and a certain regularity (*Gesetzmäßigkeit*) perceivable, only there can one to a certain extent reckon and even employ statistics. It cannot be denied that the individual thrives only on the ground of culture. Mired in dirt and hardship and barbarism, the person cannot think about his soul, and before righteousness before God comes on the agenda, civil justice (*iustitia civilis*) must be established. The higher turns into stone if that is offered instead of bread. But man does not live by bread alone; the means are not the end. All culture is intolerable when it does not recognize the individual and its mystery. The progress of the form, beyond a certain boundary, is no progress of the individual, fortunately not. I am not merely a part of the mass, a product of my time and my environment, as science announces with one voice, as though there were grounds to triumph over it. In my core I converge with eternity. Admittedly, I myself must win this core and shape [it]. Most of all, I must believe; believe that I do not come undone in the mill in which I am driven and crushed (*in der Mühle in der ich umgetrieben und zermalmt werde*); believe that God stands behind the mechanism of the world, that he can act upon my soul to pull it up to himself and help it provide for its own self, that he is the cord of an invisible and eternal community of the spirits.[157]

The declaration upon which Diels had seized did indeed emerge against a common counterposition in German intellectual history – whatever the variation in designation, classification, description, or relation – from the dichotomy between ideographic and nomothetic knowledge as stressed by the Southwest or Baden School through linguist Hermann Paul's (1846–1921) discrimination between the law-seeking (*Gesetzeswissenschaften*) and historical sciences (*Geschichtswissenschaften*) to the more customary duality of human (*Geisteswissenschaften*) and natural sciences (*Naturwissenschaften*). Nonetheless, the larger context of that text which Diels had excerpted suggests the human scientist was in pursuit of something more than a standard division of knowledge.

In this quite telling meditation – a homiletic ending to an otherwise restrained historiography – Wellhausen ultimately drew three other separable distinctions: the field of religion vs. the rest of cultural phenomena, the individual vs. the collective, and materialism vs. the divine. If he resisted a thoroughly naturalistic, deterministic, or mechanical explanation of all the universe, the historian could still affirm a certain degree of regularity for at least some developments in human history, governed processes as discerned through careful induction. This allowance permitted him to search for – and reason from – progressive stages in social organization, for example. As with the distinction between the world of nature and that of spirit, however, Wellhausen even isolated elements within the

[157] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 370–71, cf. 286; see also Wellhausen to Schwartz, February 15, 1907, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 499–501; Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 2, 1905, in ibid., 463–65. Hereupon, Wellhausen submitted his contention on the stages of religion existing alongside of one another: cf. p. 157 above.

realm of the human: religion in culture, the individual in society, and the divine behind all existence. Throughout his histories of ancient Israel, early Islam, and formative Christianity, these values emerged alongside his unacknowledged philosophical commitments. He believed human history – the connection of pasts to the present and the future – to be unified, knowable, and meaningful. He also upheld the significance of the individual and personal formation. These were the categorical beliefs for Wellhausen.

Part Two

Hermann Gunkel & Religion through History

> Our cardinal conviction of history is that we are not in the position to understand a person, a time, a concept apart from their prehistory but that we can only speak of a true, living understanding once we know the history of their formation. Historical insight means insight from the historical context.[1]

Hermann Gunkel once began a book of essays with the simple declaration, "both the history of religion and the history of literature have no other purpose but to teach understanding of the holy scriptures' true religious content." He continued *tout de suite*, "I have no doubt these means of investigation, which are permeating the center of biblical scholarship with full force, are called to serve the practical work of the church in a prominent manner."[2] Assigning histories religious and literary to the remit of biblical studies and tasking it with service to the church, this rather compact statement actually encapsulated his entire vision of studying the past. When Gunkel correlated changes in religion to those in literature, he sought to retrieve the inspiration of old in ancient persons – persons who might still have something to say in a troubled modern age. Convinced "the ultimate objective of work on the Bible is to peer into the heart of men of religion, to empathize (*mitempfinden*) with and sufficiently describe their thoughts at the very core," Gunkel wanted "to read a vibrant religion out of the [biblical] books."[3] This religion – not religion in the abstract or a class of historical phenomena – lay on the horizon as he aimed to access the ancient world. Through his labors on ancient Israel, Gunkel hoped, in the end, to recover the past for the sake of the present.

---

[1] Hermann Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 10–11 [ET: "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament," *The Monist* 13 (1903): 398–455]; cf. also, e. g., Werner Klatt, ed., "Ein Brief von Hermann Gunkel über Albert Eichhorn an Hugo Greßmann," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 66, no. 1 (1969): 1–6, at 4.

[2] Hermann Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), vii.

[3] Ibid., vi.

Part Two commences with a survey of biographical and intellectual factors most apposite to the development of his professional career, outlined in chapter four. Unlike most Bible scholars of his day, and those of almost any other for that matter, Gunkel has received a rather wide reception, albeit with varied degrees of warmth. He has the distinct honor of two respectable biographies. Written about a century after his birth, the work of Werner Klatt – the one-hundredth installment of "Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," a series which Gunkel himself had founded with the New Testament scholar Wilhelm Bousset (1865–1920) and to which he contributed the first volume – concentrates, true to the subtitle, "on his theology of the history of religion and on the development of the form-critical method."[4] Rather than focus strictly on the public record, however, Klatt commendably incorporates not only private correspondence but also personal recollections, from Gunkel's friends and his son, Werner. Klatt's account does great justice to Gunkel's own program of interrogating what lies behind the texts received over time. Benefiting from another 45 years of critical distance, Konrad Hammann has recently sifted through further archives and bequests to fashion another, extensive intellectual biography of Gunkel.[5] Together, these two monographs – alongside sundry necrologies written by friends and colleagues as well as several memoirs penned by Walter Baumgartner and Otto Eißfeldt – provide a vivid, textured portrait of Gunkel's life and labors.[6] Moreover, Martin Buss has laudably, and exceptionally, set his work within a much longer and wider interpretive tradition.[7] Considering such a wealth of material and long span in attention to Gunkel, the chapter targets more the milieu than the man, which affords a different perspective to determine the ordinary and extraordinary in his research on the ancient world. Since most of his interpreters themselves have resided in the province of biblical studies or theology, the standard lines of analysis usually aim to understand him within these particular domains. Chapter four therefore tries to shift the emphasis away from developments more internal to biblical scholarship or theology. Indeed, like so many others at the *fin de siècle*, Gunkel was swept up – some might say away – in the wave of new material pouring into modern Europe from the

[4] Werner Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel. Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 100; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969); Klatt's Hamburg dissertation provides additional sources unpublished in this volume: see idem, "Hermann Gunkel. Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode" (Dr. theol. dissertation; Hamburg, 1966). I would like to extend my gratitude to Werner Klatt for furnishing me with a copy of his thesis.

[5] Konrad Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel. Eine Biographie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014). My sincere thanks also go to Konrad Hammann for kindly sharing unpublished sources with me.

[6] For an extensive bibliography, see ibid., 389–420.

[7] Martin Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 274; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 209–62.

ancient Orient. A *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* associated with the University of Göttingen represented a movement towards unexplored dimensions of religious life, yet this same putative school constituted but one of several intellectual circles drawn to an exploration of religion that could transcend the traditional boundaries of their respective fields.

Having read the man against his times, the examination situates Gunkel's work on ancient Israel within his larger corpus. Chapter five therefore moves from the author to the authored, a transition from the whom to the what. Between his education and appointment, Gunkel was forced to recalibrate his trajectory from the New Testament to the Old, which he did by way of early Judaism – i. e., "late Judaism" in the common yet value-laden terminology current among Protestant scholars at the time. Despite his ranging explorations across languages and literatures, geographies and chronologies, however, Gunkel's questions and methods stayed the same in the end. The course he charted for research on the New Testament thus remained a constant even as he passed through other fields, from written text to oral tradition, from Christianity through Judaism and Israel back to Egypt and Babylonia, and from the extant back to the origin. Though all his work moved backwards, in a sense, he set his sights forward to the present, to the implications for life in the *Kaiserreich* and, later, the Weimar Republic. Quite characteristic of his 1890s generation, Gunkel saw an urgent need for cultural renewal – a need that he believed religion alone could satisfy. He and his confederates sought to disseminate their undertakings through *Bildungsbürgertum* by means of popularization: via public lectures, open courses, as well as the Fourth Estate. Not only his academic project, with its focus on religious life, but also his popular engagement in promoting that project itself emanated from the unnerving sense of crisis that gripped the German intelligentsia at the *fin de siècle*. The religion of ancient Israel, he judged, might serve as an elixir for the present.

After considering ancient Israel in the context of his larger corpus, the investigation turns, with chapter six, to Gunkel's means of historical reconstruction: that is to say, the how. With the pull away from the high liberal historicism that had dominated much of nineteenth-century scholarship came a push toward new conceptual horizons and new avenues to reach them. When Gunkel once described, "There were times …when the Old Testament theologians likely preferred to appear as an orientalist, as a philologist," he may well have had Wellhausen in mind.[8] He sought, instead, meanings' meaning: the collective sum or grand interpretation of small, individual conclusions. No longer could the "hobby horse" of minutiae in source criticism (*Liebhaberei für den Klein-*

[8] Hermann Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," repr. in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 11–29, at 18.

kram der Literarkritik)"[9] suffice, for the modern condition, he believed, called for restoration. Seeking internal, subjective experience as manifest in external, objectified form, Gunkel hoped to roll back the processes of transmission and materialization to access the spiritual source behind his sources. Much of his scholarship therefore probed the relationship of form and content, whether the essence of a myth transmuting through diffusion or the expression of thought through genres. Gunkel wanted to recapture, even relive, a pure, original experience of inspired ancient individuals. To understand this task, the exploration first seeks to recapture his own.

[9] Hermann Gunkel, "Ein Notschrei aus Anlaß des Buches. Himmelsbild und Weltanschauung im Wandel der Zeiten. Von Troels-Lund, Leipzig, Teubner 1899," *Die Christliche Welt* 14 (1900): 58–61, at 61.

Chapter Four

Gunkel Amidst the *Furor Orientalis*

The admiration Hermann Gunkel had for Wellhausen was anything but mutual. Gunkel praised his keen eye for textual analysis, his hand at historiographic synthesis, and even his ear for the German tongue apparent in translation. Wellhausen, by contrast, thought rather little of and about the junior scholar. On the rare occasion he did address Gunkel's work, be it in published form or private letter, the comments proved less than entirely flattering.[1] The most remarkable came in passing remarks by Wellhausen, in discussion of apocalyptic literature: "The *proton pseudos* is that he assigns great value to the question of origins at all," which had allegedly driven Gunkel, first, to search, profligately, for the very inception of a source and, second, to compare this primal material to its subsequent interpretation and adaptation by often much later authors in a line of inquiry that "has perhaps antiquarian interest but is not the task of the theologian or the exegete."[2] Gunkel objected – and objected quite vehemently – to such criticism in a response of thirty pages, which dwarfed the few of his hero. He described "this opinion of an older school" that wanted to explore the religion of ancient Israel alone, that denied the importance of Israel's encounters with other peoples, that knew of the influence from other religions yet ignored it in exegesis, that lacked the ability to see "the mighty picture of the history of the peoples and religions" behind such borrowings, and that alluded to tradition on occasion but imagined only writers.[3] In short, Wellhausen and his ilk were not historical enough in their endeavors to understand ancient texts and thus antiquity itself.

A fault line divided their visions of accessing the past, a difference of opinion concerning how far back or wide the interpreter ought to go. The rift revealed a separation not only in the ends and means of proper historical inquiry but also in the remit of theology, in the study of biblical texts. Appealing to "the judgment of the future" for the ultimate assessment of his work, Gunkel hoped to set the record straight here on the methods, even enterprise, he was advocating – for fear the grave misunderstandings propagated by this past master and protected by his authority might blight "the young seed in embryo that simply wants

[1] On the relationship between Wellhausen and Gunkel, see Kurtz, "Waiting at Nemi."

[2] Wellhausen, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur," in idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.2, *Verschiedenes*, 233.

[3] Hermann Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen. Einige principielle Erörterungen," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 42, no. 4, n.s. 7 (1899): 581–611, at 610–11.

to grow."[4] Sounding in 1899, this fracture in fact manifested cracks that had been cleaving through two generations and splitting across the human sciences. Further still, their concrete disagreement as to what, exactly, constituted a correct historiography of Israel corresponded to much larger shifts in the German Empire at the *fin de siècle* – social and political, intellectual and cultural. Such divisions did not cease anytime soon, in scholarship as elsewhere. These rival trajectories continued on past 1900, through to the end of the *Kaiserreich*, even after. As one observer notes, "Far beyond the lifetimes of their bearers, the names Wellhausen and Gunkel signify the [two] directions of critical work on the Old Testament – and actually also the New – for the course of the 20th century."[5] Knowingly, happily, willingly, or not, these directions may well still persist in biblical studies and ancient history even in the twenty-first century.

This chapter centers on the making of the scholar and his scholarship, which then constructs a frame for the more detailed portraiture of Gunkel's historiographic undertakings rendered in the two to follow. Firstly, the inquiry starts with biography. It examines his theological heritage in a family characterized by roots running deep in the Protestant church and university of northern Germany. If Gunkel followed a familiar – i. e., familial – path to Göttingen, he found his own way to the University of Giessen. Both these institutions, alongside the people who filled them, helped him set a course of research into the history of Israel. Second, the chapter considers the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, a circle of scholars associated by their time in Göttingen, as students of theology, and through their common interests in the study of religion. Noting the problem of boundaries and coherence for the analysis (or even existence) of this group, the examination then turns to the issue of distinctiveness. It surveys a longer, wider history of religious explorations *extra muros Gottingenses*, elsewhere in Prussia, Saxony, and Württemberg. Having situated *Göttinger* studies in religion amongst universities in other German-speaking lands, this investigation locates, thirdly, such preoccupations in the German Empire among other nations of Western and Central Europe. It also flags the analytical challenge of disentangling, historiographically, the "scientific study of religion" from theology, then and now alike. Finally, the chapter sets, if briefly, the types of theoretical and methodological challenges registered in research on ancient Israel within the history of the human sciences more broadly. This recrudescing interest in things irrational, religious, or "oriental" rose also in the field of classics, indology, and assyriology. These intellectual waves, rippling across the humanities, flowed alongside a change in generations and a transformation in cultural institutions. In a sense, this chapter therefore takes its cue from none other than Gunkel himself.

[4] Ibid., 611.

[5] Rudolf Smend, "Gunkel und Wellhausen," in *Hermann Gunkel (1862–1932)*, ed. Ernst-Joachim Waschke (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 141; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013), 21–40, at 22.

4.1 The Prehistory of an Historian

Already at an early age, Gunkel was primed for a métier in history, religion, and literature.[6] As he himself suggested, and his student Baumgartner later echoed, such preparation came, in part, from Joseph Victor von Scheffel's (1826–1886) historical novel *Ekkehard. Eine Geschichte aus dem zehnten Jahrhundert* as well as Gustav Freytag's (1816–1895) cultural history *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*.[7] Both these works breathed the air of nationalist zeal and exhaled brave new ideals of cultivation, which diffused across the educated middle classes that consumed them with delight. The local museum association, the Lüneburg *Museumsverein*, also trained his eye for a more expansive view of the past.[8] Further conforming to much of *Bildungsbürgertum*, Gunkel revered Goethe – a poet his father had prized, too, alongside Dante Alighieri (1265–1321).[9] In his own sons's recollection, Hermann would even contemplate transition to Goethe scholarship following longtime disaffection in the province of theology.[10] Although he would affirm, towards the end of his life, an earlier ambition to become a poet himself, Gunkel did, in fact, pen poetry lifelong, even issuing his verse for soldiers at the front in the course of the Great War.[11] His affinity for the arts likewise led him to write reviews for the theatre, which he did by pseudonym.

As for his interest in religion, Gunkel stemmed from a long line of Lutheran clergy.[12] His paternal grandfather converted name and confession alike, from Kunckel to Gunkel, to Protestant from Catholic. This Johann Dietrich Gunkel (1792–1838) studied theology in Göttingen and served as pastor in the then Kingdom of Hanover, marrying a minister's daughter, too, Emilie Karoline, whose paterfamilias likewise worked in northern Germany. Like his father, Hermann's father – Karl (1829–1897) – became a Protestant parson, learning, later lecturing on, theology in Göttingen before assuming a full pastoral position, also in the *Königreich Hannover*. Quite active in church politics, especially after Prussia's annexation of the region, in 1866, Karl helped mediate factions in the

[6] Cf. Werner Gunkel to Werner Klatt, August 8, 1967, in Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 17 n. 2.

[7] Hermann Gunkel to Hugo Greßmann, June 21, 1913, in Klatt, ed., "Ein Brief von Hermann Gunkel über Albert Eichhorn an Hugo Greßmann," 4; cf. also Gunkel, "Was will die 'religionsgeschichtliche' Bewegung?," *Deutsch-Evangelisch. Monatsblätter für den gesamten deutschen Protestantismus* 5, no. 7 (1914): 385–97, at 387 [ET: "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion," *Expository Times* 38 (1927): 532–36, at 533].

[8] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 10.

[9] Ibid., 4.

[10] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 265, cf. also 31 n. 13, 142 n. 33; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 306–07.

[11] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 10. For a list of Gunkel's poems, including those unpublished, see ibid., 389–99; cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 33 n. 26, 37–38. On his contributions to the war effort, see ibid., 220–22; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 253–65.

[12] See further Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 2–6. Gunkel's maternal side did not consist of clergy.

state (i. e., regional) church, founding, for instance, the "Protestant-Lutheran Association in the Province of Hanover," in 1875 – a time when *Vereine* of all stripes were beginning to burgeon across an at least nominally unified *Kaiserreich*. Such mediation materialized not only ecclesiastically but also theologically. A John the Baptist to Albrecht Ritschl's Jesus, Friedrich Lücke (1791–1855) introduced Karl to *Vermittlungstheologie*, a German Protestant movement that sought to reconcile such oppositions as scripture vs. experience, orthodoxy vs. liberalism, supernaturalism vs. rationalism, and traditional biblicism vs. historical criticism. Though no formal student of Ritschl's, Karl did have personal contact with him and even defended his program.[13] If the apple fell close to the tree, it did roll a distance on impact.

Following family tradition, Hermann studied in Göttingen, where he occupied a room in the *Theologisches Stift*, a residential college founded to foster theological education. He matriculated spring semester of 1881 and spent a total of two at the Georgia Augusta before transferring for a three-term stint at the Ludoviciana, in Giessen, from summer of 1882 through that of 1883. (While students mostly attended the university closest to home, they often visited elsewhere in the course of their studies, too.) In Michaelmas semester, 1883, he returned to his first alma mater to finish his degree there, receiving a licentiate of theology in spring of 1888. Both these universities afforded untold opportunities and set the academic path before him.

Gunkel cut his teeth on the theology of Ritschl, a commanding presence in Göttingen. Many (likely most) appraisals of Gunkel's formative period place preeminence in this particular province, emphasizing, inter alia, a kind of academic Oedipalism.[14] Viewed by Gunkel with hindsight as "a stock character of the Prussian civil servant" and by a Göttingen theologian another five decennia later as the embodiment of "late bourgeois culture of the nineteenth century," Ritschl commanded theology from the 1870s onward, this "king of the faculty" with his name "in the air everywhere."[15] Indeed, liberal theology would owe great debts to

[13] Ibid., 4–5, cf. 14.

[14] For recent appraisals of Ritschl, see Johannes Zachhuber, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F. C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch* (Changing Paradigms in Historical and Systematic Theology; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 131–285; Mark D. Chapman, *Ernst Troeltsch and Liberal Theology: Religion and Cultural Synthesis in Wilhelmine Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 14–25; for more thorough description of the "Ritschlian School," see especially Weinhardt, *Wilhelm Herrmanns Stellung in der Ritschlschen Schule*, 7–125; cf. Frederick Gregory, *Nature Lost? Natural Science and the German Theological Tradition of the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 201–30.

[15] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 14; Troeltsch to Bousset, December 23, 1885, cited in Chapman, *Ernst Troeltsch and Liberal Theology*, 19. Even more indicting, Jan Rehmann argues, "Ritschl was to the consolidation of cultural Protestantism as an influential ideology of the ruling power bloc what Schleiermacher was to the constitution of a cultural Protestant religiosity of the educated classes" (idem, *Max Weber: Modernisation as Passive Revolution, A Gramscian Analysis*, trans. Max Henniger [Historical Materialism Book Series 78; Leiden: Brill, 2015],

the Ritschlians – especially in their response to the kind of Left Hegelian thought and radical historicism that had swept over Tübingen before the 1860s.[16] As Heschel spies, however, "With Ritschl, a new and radical exclusion of the Jewish from early Christianity began to grow in New Testament scholarship."[17] Such exclusion Gunkel and his cohort would seek to overcome – at least to some degree – in their search for early Christian origins beyond the Old Testament sources, a sort of reaction to a reaction. Seeing his deep if latent interest in historical pursuits, the *Stift* inspector Wilhelm Bornemann (1858–1946) recommended Gunkel go to Giessen – a stint whose significance could only be underestimated.[18]

When Gunkel went to Giessen, he learned the Old Testament trade from one of its most esteemed masters, namely, Bernhard Stade.[19] By 1882, Stade had already launched the periodical *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1881), published the first, and only, volume of his *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik* (1879), written on the Ethiopic language (1871, 1873), and printed an installment of his eventual two-tome *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. e., *Geschichte Israels unter der Königsherrschaft* (1881), which itself comprised but a single title in Wilhelm Oncken's (1838–1905) expansive forty-five-volume "Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen."[20] Moreover, he had famously – at the time controversially – revamped the Faculty of Theology. He even served as rector during Gunkel's sojourn there (1882–1883). In the field of Old Testament studies, Stade built a positive history on the ground leveled three years prior by Wellhausen's critical analysis in (*Prolegomena zur) Geschichte Israels* and in more technical studies on composition history, as observed by more than one reviewer at the time.[21]

307–08 [GO: *Max Weber. Modernisierung als passive Revolution: Kontextstudien zu Politik, Philosophie und Religion im Übergang zum Fordismus* (Berlin: Argument-Verlag, 1998)]).

[16] In Klatt's assessment, offered in relation to Gunkel, "The significance of the moral dimension for theology, the responsibility of a calling, the connection of theological scholarship with other fields of scholarship, the concept of progress, and the connection of religion to people – these are all characteristics of liberal theology that ultimately trace back to Ritschl" (*Hermann Gunkel,* 265, cf. 208). Klatt notes, however, the impact of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) and Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) on Ritschl as well.

[17] Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 123; cf. p. 225 n. 85 below.

[18] See Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 15, 18.

[19] On the relationship between Stade and Gunkel, see esp. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 18–20, 199–200, 204–06.

[20] Stade styled his work on Hebrew grammar as a synthesis to Ewald's thesis and Olshausen's antithesis – dedicating his volume to the latter – and further drew a correspondence between his own on the Hebrew language and that by Nöldeke on Aramaic (idem, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik*, Vol. 1, *Schriftlehre, Lautlehre, Formenlehre* [Leipzig: Vogel, 1879], v).

[21] Hermann Guthe, review of *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Parts 1 & 2, 1881, by Bernhard Stade, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 8, no. 11 (1883): 241–45, at 244; Eduard Meyer, review of *Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, 1887, by Bernhard Stade, *Historische Zeitschrift* 61, no. 3 (1889): 461–64, at 462; Emil Kautzsch, "Bericht über die 1881 auf dem Gebiete der hebräischen Sprachkunde, alttestamentlichen Exegese und biblischen Theologie, sowie der Geschichte Israels erschienenen Bücher und Aufsätze," in *Wissenschaftlicher Jahresbericht über die Morgenländischen Studien im Jahre 1881*, ed. H. Kern et al. (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1885): 60–107, at 98–99; cf. also

Tradition holds his students called him "Yahweh," and the same divine inducted Gunkel into Old Testament scholarship. Over two decades after his time in Giessen, Gunkel accredited Stade with ushering in a brave new world of inquiry. As "a founder of a new, great, religio-historical consideration," Stade saw survivals in ancient Israelite religion and sought further explanation among "lower cultural stages."[22] Gunkel's own explorations would expand this set of data.

In addition to Old Testament erudition, Giessen offered Gunkel quite auspicious access to yet another luminary: Adolf (not yet von) Harnack.[23] Though only *ordinarius* for two years before Gunkel's arrival, Harnack had already formed the Church History Society in Leipzig (1874), founded the journal *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1876), and grounded the series "Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur" (1882). Stade had secured him by design in what became a publicized "reorganization" of the Faculty.[24] An eventual opponent of institutionalized *Religionsgeschichte*, the extraordinarily influential Harnack would prove a lifelong mentor to Gunkel. Gunkel's first monograph made its way to Harnack in hopes he might "recognize upon each and every page my own dependence on you," while his Genesis commentary, first published in 1901, had Harnack as dedicatee, "from whom, next to my father, I have learned the most among all my theological teachers and whose amicable benevolence

---

Julius Wellhausen, review of *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, by Bernhard Stade, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 3, no. 19 (1882): 681–82; as well as Stade's response in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 3, no. 22 (1882): 813–14. Jülicher soon defended his friend Wellhausen in a review of Stade's subsequent installment: cf. Jülicher, review of *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, by Bernhard Stade, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 6, no. 8 (1885): 270–71; see further Friedrich Giesebrecht, review of *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1, no. 2, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 6, no. 19 (1881): 441–44, at 441; cf. also, inter alia, Wellhausen to William Robertson Smith, August 11, 1881, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 87–88.

[22] Hermann Gunkel, "Bernhard Stade. Charakterbild eines modernen Theologen," repr. in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 1–10, at 6; idem, review of *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. 1, *Die Religion Israels und die Entstehung des Judentums*, by Bernhard Stade, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 27, no. 47 (1906): 2939–2943, at 2940.

[23] Harnack would receive such designation only in 1914. For an overview of Harnack, see Kurt Nowak, "Historische Einführung," in Kurt Nowak, ed., *Adolf von Harnack als Zeitgenosse. Reden und Schriften aus den Jahren des Kaiserreichs und der Weimarer Republik,* Vol. 1, *Der Theologe und Historiker* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996), 1–95; see further Kurt Nowak et al., ed., *Adolf von Harnack. Christentum, Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft: Wissenschaftliches Symposium aus Anlaß des 150. Geburtstags* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003); Nottmeier, *Adolf von Harnack und die deutsche Politik, 1890–1930*. For the relationship between the two, see Claus-Dieter Osthövener, "'Eine neue Flutwelle historischen Geistes'. Hermann Gunkel und Adolf von Harnack," in *Kontexte. Biografische und forschungsgeschichtliche Schnittpunkte der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft: Festschrift für Hans Jochen Boecker zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Thomas Wagner, Dieter Vieweger, and Kurt Erlemann (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2008), 131–56.

[24] See Nottmeier, *Adolf von Harnack*, 88–91; cf. Weinhardt, *Wilhelm Herrmanns Stellung in der Ritschlschen Schule*, 53–56; Smend, "Eine neue Fakultät für eine neue Theologie. Gießen 1877–1882"; for his own account, see Stade, *Die Reorganisation der Theologischen Fakultät zu Gießen.*

has accompanied my studies throughout the decades."[25] Even more, both would work together in Berlin, beginning in 1895. Yet Harnack was hardly *avant-garde*, especially at this stage in his career. He fully upheld the kind of rational skepticism and philhellenism standard in the Prussian Protestant establishment, despite at times vehement protestations against his personage from bulwarks of orthodoxy. Indeed, Harnack embodied liberal theology. His own historicist interest in cleansing Christianity, searching for some true "essence," and pursuing special personalities surely inspired the young Gunkel in Giessen.[26] Still other stirrings doubtless came to Gunkel from elsewhere.

While Martin Rade (1857–1940) later ascribed to Harnack an "unwitting" paternity of "the" *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, Harnack considered himself a proud if sometimes disapproving father.[27] Yet in Wellhausen's appraisal, Bernhard Duhm was the true "progenitor."[28] First serving as lecturer (1871–1875) at the *Stift* and private docent (1873–1877) at the Faculty of Theology in Göttingen, the East Frisian Duhm held an associate position when Gunkel began his studies, though the former would move to Basel as *ordinarius*, in 1889, once the latter received his licentiate.[29] Before Gunkel's matriculation, Duhm had produced

[25] Gunkel to Harnack, November 14, 1888, in Adolf Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums. Sechzehn Vorlesungen vor Studierenden aller Fakultäten im Wintersemester 1899/1900 an der Universität gehalten*, 3rd ed., ed. Claus-Dieter Osthövener (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 234; cf. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 20; Gunkel, *Genesis*, 1st ed. (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 1/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), foreword. For the third edition, of 1910, Gunkel affirmed such feelings in his accompanying correspondence with Harnack, referring to "my steadfast gratefulness towards the only one of my early teachers who did not turn away from me when I began to take my own paths" (Gunkel to Harnack, March 14, 1910, in Nottmeier, *Adolf von Harnack und die deutsche Politik*, 1890–1930, 282).

[26] On Harnack's appeal to Gunkel, see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 18, 20–22.

[27] See Hans Rollmann, "Ein Brief Adolf von Harnacks an Rudolf Otto über die Gnadenreligion Indiens," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 31, no. 4 (1979): 399–401; cf. idem, "Theologie und Religionsgeschichte. Zeitgenössische Stimmen zur Diskussion um die religionsgeschichtliche Methode und die Einführung religionsgeschichtlicher Lehrstühle in den theologischen Fakultäten um die Jahrhundertwende," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 80 (1983): 69–84. On Harnack's intellectual paternity, see also Johann Hinrich Claussen, *Die Jesus-Deutung von Ernst Troeltsch im Kontext der liberalen Theologie* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 99; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 27–37; cf. also Johanna Jantsch, ed., *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Adolf von Harnack und Martin Rade. Theologie auf dem öffentlichen Markt* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996), 96–97.

[28] Wellhausen to Enno Littmann, January 21, 1915, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 630; cf. also Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 18, 1905, in ibid., 466–67. On Duhm, see Alfred Bertholet, "Bernhard Duhm," in *Deutsches biographisches Jahrbuch*, Vol. 10, *1928* [1931]: 45–52; Rudolf Smend, "Wissende Prophetendeutung. Zum 150. Geburtstag Bernhard Duhms," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 54 (1998): 289–99.

[29] Cf. University of Göttingen, *Chronik der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1889–90* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1890), 33–34; Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities and University of Göttingen, *Nachrichten von der K*[*öniglichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität aus dem Jahre 1875*, 276–77, 660; idem, *Nachrichten von der K*[*öniglichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität*

only his *Göttinger* licentiate thesis, *Pauli Apostoli de Judaeorum religione judicia exposita et dijudicata* (1873), and *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion* (1875). The latter made a huge impact, finding favor, for instance, with the Netherlandish Kuenen and the British Thomas Kelly Cheyne (1841–1915).[30] In subsequent assessment, Kuenen would see this volume as clearing the path for Wellhausen's own victory in the war over "Grafianism,"[31] and, in fact, Duhm's monograph on the proph-

aus dem Jahre 1877 (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1877), 228. On Gunkel's relationship with Duhm, see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*., 15, 25–26, 29–30, 38–39, 83.

[30] Abraham Kuenen, "Critische bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van den Israëlietischen godsdienst. 9. Nog eens de priesterlijke bestanddeelen van Pentateuch en Jozua," *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 9 (1875): 512–36, at 517–26. Duhm did receive favorable as well as less auspicious comparison to his former teacher Ritschl, in the second instance with reference to dogmatism: Thomas Kelly Cheyne, "The Development of Israelite Prophecy," *The Academy* 8, n.s. 190 (December 25, 1875): 653–54; but cf. Henning Graf Reventlow, "Die Prophetie im Urteil Bernhard Duhms," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 85 (1988): 259–74. For reviews of Duhm alongside other works on prophecy published that same year, see Franz Heinrich Reusch, "Messianische Weissagungen," *Theologisches Literaturblatt* 11, no. 17 (1876): 385–88; Adalbert Merx, review of *De profeten en de profetie onder Israël*, by Abraham Kuenen, and *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion*, by Bernhard Duhm, *Jenaer Literaturzeitung* 3, no. 2 (1876): 17–20.

[31] Abraham Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua)*, trans., from the second edition, Philip Henry Wicksteed (London: Macmillan, 1886), xxxv, xxxviii; John William Colenso had translated part of the first edition as *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*, although the bastard title – *Critical Examination of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua* – distinguished this work from his own (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865) [Dutch Original: *Historisch-kritisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds*, Vol. 1, *Het ontstaan van de historische boeken des Ouden Verbonds*, 1st ed. (Leiden: Engels, 1861); 2nd ed., *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds*, Vol. 1.1, *De Hexateuch* (Leiden: Engels, 1885), Vol. 1.2, *De historische boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (Leiden: Engels, 1887); German Translation: *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des alten Testaments, hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung*, Vol. 1.1, *Die Entstehung des Hexateuch*, trans. T. Weber, 1st. installment (Leipzig: Schulze, 1885), complete volume (Leipzig: Schulze, 1887), Vol. 1.2, *Die historischen Bücher des alten Testaments*, trans. T. Weber (Leipzig: Reisland, 1890)]. Wicksteed collected various contributions by Kuenen to *Theologisch Tijdschrift* to compose a brief history of biblical criticism, appended to his translation (xi–xl, cf. vii). He also served as a longtime promoter of Kuenen's (see idem, "Kuenen's Religion of Israel," *The Academy* 8, n.s. 184 [November 13, 1875]: 496–98; idem, "Abraham Kuenen," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 4, no. 4 [1892]: 571–605). Likewise, beginning with his fourth edition of Friedrich Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Wellhausen reproduced material from Kuenen published in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* for a brief history of biblical scholarship since Bleek: namely, Abraham Kuenen, "Critische bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van den Israëlietischen godsdienst. 5. De priesterlijke bestanddeelen van Pentateuch en Josua. Eerste Gedeelte," *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 4 (1870): 391–426; cf. Wellhausen to Kuenen, July 16, 1877, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 40. Elsewhere, Wellhausen called Kuenen the "*Goel*" of Graf, "who has had the chief share in the task of developing and enforcing the hypothesis of Graf" (idem, "Pentateuch and Joshua," 509, italics original). Kuenen may well have found his own *goel* in Wellhausen, who once wrote of the former, "As a synthesist, he leaves something to be desired, as analyst – and as a person – he is second to none. Also by singling out individual difficult and

ets forced Wellhausen to print his studies on the Hexateuch even earlier than intended.[32] Yet apart from his inaugural address, "Über Ziel und Methode der theologischen Wissenschaft" (1889), Duhm would issue zero literary output until 1892, when his Isaiah commentary burst onto the scene and placed him center stage.[33] He would play a major role, in the end, against the backdrop of research on the prophets in particular and that on ecstasy in general.

During Gunkel's time in Göttingen, though, Duhm's impact came less through print than person.[34] Only in 1885, once he had finished at the University of Giessen, did Gunkel have any class with Duhm, and then he merely had two, the history of Israel and the eschatology of Paul.[35] Their paths crossed, much more, in the "Academic-Theological Association" (*Akademisch-theologischer Verein*), a Göttingen band of would-be theologians founded by Bornemann and William Wrede (1859–1906), in 1878.[36] Indeed, this intense engagement helped forge any number of contacts that would shape research on the Bible leading up to the Great War. That precarious yet crucial category "influence" may have befallen Gunkel through direct exchange with Duhm, but it doubtless met him indirectly, too: through his tight-knit clique of colleagues, who had dealings with Duhm as well. Furthermore, such early intercourse almost surely opened channels that could ensure a smoother flow of intellectual traffic even after Duhm's surge in importance, after 1892. His impact, then, was not confined to the Georgia Augusta.

Theology alone could not slake his thirst for knowledge. Unquenched and even insatiate, a prodigious curiosity drove Gunkel to other fonts of academic study. Upon his *retour* from Giessen, in autumn term, 1883, he participated in a variety of courses, from German studies through philosophy to history and classics. Former *ordinarius* in Greifswald (1876–83), student of Usener,

---

characterist[ic] bits, he proceeds very wisely; one can demonstrate so much better the literar[y] tendencies. Of course, he does have the advantage of being able to start from a general basis that I have essentially provided him" (Wellhausen to Jülicher, November 8, 1880, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 78; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, February 6, 1883, in ibid., 117–18; Wellhausen to Smith, January 21, 1885, in ibid., 166–67; Wellhausen to Smith, [March 23, 1885,] in ibid., 171–72). Kuenen himself contended, "Wellhausen's treatment of our theme, for which I must refer to his book itself, was so cogent, so original, and so brilliant, that its publication may be regarded as the 'crowning fight' in the long campaign" (idem, "Introduction," in *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch [Pentateuch and Book of Joshua]*, xxxix).

[32] Cf. pp. 80–81 above; see also Wellhausen's own review of the work in *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 21 (1876): 152–58. Wellhausen's first studies appeared in this very issue of *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*.

[33] Wellhausen once commented, "Everyone overlooks Duhm, but he will remain a constant *extraordinarius* in Göttingen, and [he] does not want to be anything else" (Wellhausen to William Robertson Smith, November 10, 1882, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 111–12).

[34] Hammann does report Gunkel's reference to *Die Theologie der Propheten* in a paper on Isaiah written for Stade in Giessen (idem, *Hermann Gunkel*, 19).

[35] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 15; Rudolf Smend, "Hermann Gunkel, 1862–1932," in idem, *From Astruc to Zimmerli*, 118–31, at 120.

[36] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 24–26.

and son-in-law of Mommsen, the Junker Wilamowitz moved to Göttingen that same term, succeeding Ernst von Leutsch (1808–1887) as professor of classical studies – himself a pedigreed pupil of Karl Otfried Müller (1797–1840) and August Boeckh (1785–1867).[37] Wilamowitz lectured Gunkel, among others, on Aristophanes' *Archanians* the following semester, spring of 1884.[38] A year later, in Easter term, 1885, Gunkel sat in attendance for "The History of Greek Literature from Alexander to Augustus." The waves Wilamowitz made in method swept over Gunkel and his ilk. Indeed, Gerd Lüdemann and Martin Schröder, since seconded by others, have weighed his import for Gunkel and the cohort. First, beyond the well-worn implement of philology, Wilamowitz added ancient history, archaeology, and other auxiliary sciences to the toolbox of *Altertumskunde* or *Altertumswissenschaft*, that is, of classical scholarship. Second, he appraised post-classical Greek history, culture, and literature as a legitimate field of study, which countered a rather long tradition of devaluing the "Hellenistic" era in favor of the prized classical period.[39] These two elements, i. e., the expansion of methodical approach and the temporal extension of investigated object, would characterize Gunkel's own research as well. In fact, their exchange would not end in Göttingen. Wilamowitz saw explicit reference in the years 1900 and 1911 – Gunkel otherwise quite reserved in his documentation – and both held concurrent posts in Berlin, the latter as *extraordinarius* in 1895, the former as *ordinarius* in 1897.[40] Wilamowitz, however, had rather little interest in religion. Comparative ventures, too, had comparatively limited allure.[41]

Yet religion did impel another Gunkel mentor: namely, Paul de Lagarde. On his return to the Georgia Augusta, Gunkel read with de Lagarde the Hebrew poems of medieval rabbi Yehuda Alharizi (1165–1225), which he studied again the spring semester of 1885. That same term, in 1885, de Lagarde gave a course

[37] William M. Calder, III, represents Wilamowitz's most prolific interpreter: see, e. g., idem, "How Did Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff Read a Text?," *The Classical Journal* 86 (1991): 344–52; idem, "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: Sospitator Euripidis." On Wilamowitz in Göttingen specifically, see Cornelia Wegeler, "Das Institut für Altertumskunde der Universität Göttingen 1921–1962. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie seit Wilamowitz," in *Die Universität Göttingen unter dem Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Heinrich Becker, Hans-Joachim Dahms, and Cornelia Wegeler, 2nd ed. (Munich: Saur, 1998), 337–64, at 337–40.

[38] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 23 n. 40.

[39] Gerd Lüdemann and Martin Schröder, ed., *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen. Eine Dokumentation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 33–36; cf. also Gerd Lüdemann, "Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule," in *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, ed. Bernd Moeller (Göttinger Universitätsschriften A/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 325–61.

[40] In his assessment of Gunkel's contact with classics, Buss observes the role of Wilamowitz in Gunkel's "Das vierte Buch Esra" (idem, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 228; but cf. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 125 n. 161). Both contributed essays to *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*: Wilamowitz in *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache* (1/8), Gunkel in *Die orientalischen Literaturen* (1/7).

[41] See Marchand, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism," 142–47.

on Syriac especially for Gunkel, who also learned Arabic from him.[42] Gunkel could have done worse, philologically, than learn from de Lagarde. After all, de Lagarde had succeeded the esteemed Ewald as the professor of oriental languages in the Faculty of Philosophy, occupied the former seat of medievalist Georg Waitz (1813–1886) – who had consolidated the Georgia Augusta's famous Historical Seminar and later edited the monumental *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* – in the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen,[43] and even won appointment as a privy councillor. More than mere language or text, de Lagarde had a deep – nay, dear – interest in religion. He championed, forcefully, the comparative study of religion in order to access the very nature of religion itself, imagining no "philosophical" but a "thoroughly historical discipline" beneath the term theology.[44]

In this regard, de Lagarde's inquiry into religion matched that into textual history. Both programs entailed analysis of separable families to arrive at still a truer substance – a theory reflected in the language of form vs. content and eternality vs. ephemerality – although he outlined no comprehensive program to recover an *Urreligion* in the same way he did an *Urtext*. According to de Lagarde, both zoology and linguistics proved the comparative endeavor to be "the solution in all scholarship."[45] Thence came his call for comparative religion (*comparative Religionswissenschaft*). His unbending empirical program had grander ambitions still. As Robert Lougee avers, in his overlooked volume,

> Lagarde did not present his ideas as a program which men might take or leave. He presented them as dogmas, though he would not have liked this term applied to them. He believed that his fellow Germans must accept them and act on them or perish. His national religion … was not apart from but identical with his philosophy of history and society. To state the elements of his philosophy of history and society is to state precisely the dogmas of his national religion. Lagarde's *Zeitkritik*, animated by a profound sense of mission, was a wide-ranging attack on a world which did not meet the standards required by these dogmas. They may be stated as follows: (1) That God reveals Himself and His will in the

[42] The only source for Gunkel's study of Arabic seems to be recollection from Walter Baumgartner, "Zum 100. Geburtstag von Hermann Gunkel," in *Congress Volume, Bonn 1962* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 9; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 1–18 [repr. in Gunkel, *Genesis*, 6th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 1–18, at 3–4]; in addition to Baumgartner, Rahlfs confirmed Gunkel's study of Syriac: Alfred Rahlfs, *Paul de Lagardes wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk im Rahmen einer Geschichte seines Lebens dargestellt* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 4/1; Göttingen: Dieterich, 1928), 91–92.

[43] Paul de Lagarde, "Mittheilungen über Paul Anton de Lagarde," in idem, *Mittheilungen,* Vol. 3 (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1889), 34–41, at 34; cf. Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair*, 16; Lattke, *Paul Anton de Lagarde und das Judentum*, 120.

[44] De Lagarde, *Ueber das verhältnis des deutschen staates zu theologie, kirche und religion,* 44. Vincent Viaene even writes, "Lagarde considered himself to be first and foremost a historian of religion. His political writings served the same goal as his scholarly ones: to advance the kingdom of God" (idem, "Paul de Lagarde," 530); cf. Lougee, *Paul de Lagarde*, 136; see further Robert Hanhart, "Paul Anton de Lagarde und seine Kritik an der Theologie," 289; Heinrich Karpp, "Lagardes Kritik an Kirche und Theologie," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 49 (1952): 367–85.

[45] De Lagarde, *Ueber die gegenwärtige lage des deutschen reichs. ein bericht*, 137.

history of the nation. (2) That God's highest creation and concern is the individual man. (3) That the individual man can develop his potentialities only within the organic community of the nation. (4) That the Kingdom will be realized as the national community becomes perfect and men perceive how God has spoken to their nation in the past and understand the meaning of His word in the present. (5) That the new "historical" theology will show the way.[46]

Politically polarizing, personally unpopular, yet professionally praised, de Lagarde was no stranger to controversy. Such thorough historicization alongside the comparative venture offered sharp contrast to the Ritschlian program, which may well have attracted Gunkel as much as it did theologian Ernst Troeltsch (1865–1923).[47]

In the end, Gunkel would vacillate in his appraisal of Lagardian influence. While he downplayed such significance in the year 1904, he affirmed it once again about a decade later, whereas Troeltsch remained consistent in his own assertion of significance.[48] As Friedrich Wilhelm Graf avers, de Lagarde's impor-

---

[46] Lougee, *Paul de Lagarde,* 143–44.

[47] Cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 24 n. 31, 27 n. 43; See further Rudolf Kittel, "Die Zukunft der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Vortrag auf dem Ersten Deutschen Orientalistentag in Leipzig (Sondertagung der Alttestamentlichen Forscher) am 29. Sept. 1921," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 39 (1921): 84–99; idem, "Die Zukunft der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft," *Die Christliche Welt* 36 (1922): 323–24; Max Reischle*, Theologie und Religionsgeschichte. Fünf Vorlesungen gehalten auf dem Ferienkurs in Hannover im Oktober 1903* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1904), 17. Hans-Georg Drescher argues, "What attracted Troeltsch to Lagarde was the way in which Lagarde gave religious phenomenon a place in history, and rejected any view of the religious with a speculative or dogmatic colouring" (idem, *Ernst Troeltsch: His Life and Work*, trans. John Bowden [London: SCM Press, 1992], 45); cf. also Horst Renz, "Troeltschs Theologiestudium," in *Untersuchungen zur Biographie und Werkgeschichte,* ed. idem and Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 2nd ed. (Troeltsch-Studien 1; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1985), 48–59, at 56; Graf, "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät'. Ernst Troeltschs Promotionsthesen und ihr Göttinger Kontext," in ibid., 235–90, at 283–84, cf. also 250, 240.

[48] Cf. Hermann Gunkel, review of *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, by Max Reischle, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 25, no. 18 (1904): 1100–1110, at 1103; idem, "Gedächtnisrede auf Wilhelm Bousset, gehalten in der Universität Giessen am 9. Mai 1920," *Evangelische Freiheit* 20 (1920): 141–62; Gunkel to Hugo Greßmann, June 21, 1913, in Klatt, ed., "Ein Brief von Hermann Gunkel über Albert Eichhorn an Hugo Greßmann," 4; cf. also Greßmann, *Albert Eichhorn und Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914), 20, cf. 5. On Troeltsch's own assessment, see Troeltsch to Hugo Greßmann, June 4, 1913, in Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 22–23. Though the culprit be unclear, Ruth Conrad has observed the removal of Lagardian influence from Rade's manuscript for the entry on *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* for the second edition of *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (idem, *Lexikonpolitik. Die erste Auflage der RGG im Horizont protestantischer Lexikographie* [Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 97; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006], 312–13) – a change Hammann assigns to Gunkel himself (*Hermann Gunkel*, 214 n. 70); cf. also Hugo Greßmann, "de Lagarde, Paul Anton," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung*, Vol. 3, *Heßhus–Lytton,* 1st ed., ed. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1912), 1919–22. Although the timing proves uncertain, Gunkel's son does report de Lagarde's portrait hanging on his father's office wall (Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 230 n. 9).

tance was likely greater than often assumed.[49] Subsequent distancing by Gunkel may have flowed from several sources. While de Lagarde's insistence on historical perspective and comparative pursuits might have attracted Gunkel initially, the latter's later creation of and rumination on his own divergent program – especially with regard to theology's task and nature – could well have repelled him from Lagardian gravitation. (Although he sabotaged Gunkel's career in Göttingen, such scheming was likely unknown to the latter.[50]) Similarly, the tendency in the secondary literature to pursue the master's impact on the pupil may come from de Lagarde's ultimate drive toward National Socialism or from the rehearsal of accounts by Gunkel's cohort and contemporaries.[51]

Internal historiography of the time at the Georgia Augusta no doubt overvalued and undervalued the gain from certain figures. Eventual proximity to or distance from the scholars themselves and positions they held were probably projected on the past – such memories re-calibrated over the course of time. Already in 1890, at the conclusion of a customary stint spent teaching between initial university studies and licentiate degree, Heinrich Hackmann (1864–1935), for example, implied his own recognition of formative figures had come only after subsequent reflection, though subsequence here be only years, not decades:

> If I draw a conclusion from what I learned in Göttingen, especially from Duhm, Ritschl, and Lagarde – a conclusion, incidentally, that was by far unclear to me when I left Göttingen but which Göttingen's stimuli gradually developed in me, then it is the following: I learned that the objects of theology are irrational – thus understanding only far too distant, the childlike spirit still most immediately graspable, if also so massive – that the reflecting individual is horrified by it; I have learned that there are many theologians, good and bad, who want to grasp the irrational of religion but that one must be on his guard to take something – even something that appears so awe-inspiring, that is so ostentatious and filigreed – for religion, for incontrovertible authority; but that theological attempts at the religious bring us further when we take them only for what they can be, that they become the torment of the human spirit only when they have become idols, as has happened so often.[52]

---

[49] See Graf, "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät,'" 283–84, cf. also 250.

[50] Rather than Gunkel, de Lagarde hoped to promote his student Rahlfs (see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 32–33, 49–50; see pp. 210–11 below. In Rahlfs's own recollection, de Lagarde was rather unwelcoming to him initially, in the Syriac course first scheduled exclusively for Gunkel (idem, *Paul de Lagardes wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk im Rahmen einer Geschichte seines Lebens*, 91–92). The machinations of Bernhard Weiß, however, may not have been unbeknownst to him: see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 49–50.

[51] For subsequent evaluations, with varying documentation, see, e. g., Hans Rollmann, "*Paulus alienus*: William Wrede on Comparing Jesus and Paul," in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare,* ed. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984), 23–45, at 33–38; Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 24, 27; Hanhart, "Paul Anton de Lagarde," esp. 300–05; Hans-Walter Schütte, "Theologie als Religionsgeschichte. Das Reformprogramm Paul de Lagardes," *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 8 (1966): 111–20.

[52] Hans Rollmann, "Duhm, Lagarde, Ritschl und der irrationale Religionsbegriff der Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule. Die *Vita hospitis* Heinrich Hackmanns als geistes- und theologie-

Filled as they are with reminiscences alongside teleology and often pragmatic objectives, such intellectual autobiographies do supply a crucial if at times a questionable access to the past. The historiography both by and of this Göttingen cohort has constructed an ambivalent portrait of Duhm as well as de Lagarde. In the process, Duhm's actual import may well have waxed and that of de Lagarde have wained.

Such Semitic studies notwithstanding, Gunkel was rather unprepared for life as an *Alttestamentler*, at least the kind expected in the long nineteenth century – and perhaps more conservative institutions even to this day. Eißfeldt remembered his own teacher and Wellhausen-confidant Smend (Sr.) saying, on more than one occasion, "Gentleman, he does not know Hebrew! He does not know Hebrew!"[53] De Lagarde's own negative assessment appears amidst a rather devious attempt to promote a different student – his chosen Rahlfs – which may vitiate his appraisal for understanding Gunkel. According to oral tradition, transmitted, again, by Baumgartner, Gunkel actually did acknowledge an insufficient competence in Semitic philology – despite his studies with de Lagarde – and intentionally approached the Hebrew Bible in terms of literary history as a kind of compensation, an intellectual course chartered by Herder and the Alsatian Édouard – or Eduard, given his German sympathies – Reuß in the sphere of biblical studies as well as Eduard Norden (1868–1941) and Paul Wendland (1864–1815) within the realm of classics.[54] Nevertheless, Gunkel's own enumeration of his most important teachers appeared in crucial retrospect, once he had finally become established: it was an attempt to explain his path only after the end was reached. During his time at the Georgia Augusta, he was a would-be New Testament scholar.

4.2 A *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*; or, Göttingen Inter Alia

The study of religion did not allure Gunkel alone. He alongside several others comprised the so-called "History of Religion(s) School" in Göttingen. As he reflected later on, "The school that emerged was unusual indeed. A school without

geschichtliches Dokument," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 34, no. 3 (1982): 276–79, at 277.

[53] Otto Eißfeldt, "Sechs Jahrzehnte Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," in *Volume du Congrès International pour l'étude de l'Ancien Testament, Genève 1966* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 15; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 1–13, at 3.

[54] In his foreword to a poetry volume composed by Georg Daniel Hirtz (1804–1893), Reuß once crowed, "We speak German (the word proves popular!), [but that] does not mean we simply want to renounce our mother tongue, but it means that in our entire manner and tradition, in our belief, desire, and deed, we preserve German vigor [*Kraft*] and fidelity, German solemnity and public spirit, German altruism and sociability and desire to bequeath [it all] as a holy possession to our children. This is our patriotism! On both banks of the Rhine live, for us, only One People" – with excerpts from this foreword being circulated in many periodicals thereafter (Hirtz, *Gedichte* [Strasbourg: Dannbach, 1838], i–xii, at xi).

teachers and, even more, without pupils! It was a close group of young scholars bound together by reciprocal friendship."[55] Yet the group's borders as well as its center have long been rather fuzzy, and such blurred boundaries obscure exactly who resided within them and precisely when they did.[56] Whether this School even existed already at Göttingen or only after school was out – once these students became scholars and accounted for the course of their careers – merits further analysis. So, too, the existence of *the* History of Religion School, as opposed to one among many, deserves consideration beyond the narrow field of theology, in the wider history of the humanities.

In perhaps the most disciplined assessment of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* in general and the person of Troeltsch in particular, Graf has narrowed the frame of inquiry and provided essential focus. He limits the parameters strictly to those young theologians in Göttingen who received their licentiate degrees between the Februaries of 1888 and 1893 and pursued habilitation immediately thereafter, though the specific field of study in the province of theology did, in fact, differ among them.[57] Another geographical dimension united most of them as well: almost all came to (for the locals) "Chöttingen" from northern Germany.[58] The majority, too, were sons of Lutheran pastors and showed a strong affinity for New Testament expertise. Not only did they submit strikingly similar theses for their licentiate proceedings, but they even selected one another as opponents for the official disputation with decided regularity.[59] In the end, Graf carefully concludes with description of "a *group* of younger theologians who, beginning at a certain point in time …, had close, reciprocal exchange and, in the process, agreed that it is a task of theology to do justice to the lived facticity of religion over and against pure theology – what implied a rejection of the theological program that Ritschl represented."[60] Divergence notwithstanding, certain common qualities characterize much of their diverse research. Kurt Rudolph, in turn, has enumerated with keen insight both the profile and the produce of this specific

[55] Gunkel, "Gedächtnisrede auf Wilhelm Bousset," 146.

[56] Cf. Otto Eißfeldt, "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 4, *Mi–R*, 2nd ed., ed. Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1930), 1898–1905; Graf, "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät,'" esp. 279–83; Lüdemann and Schröder, "Von der 'kleinen Göttinger Fakultät' zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule," in *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen*, ed. Lüdemann and Schröder, 13–23; cf. Gerd Lüdemann, "Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule," in *Theologie in Göttingen,* ed. Moeller, 325–61, at 326–36; see further Konrad, *Lexikonpolitik*, esp. 203–10.

[57] Graf, "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät,'" 239, see also 288–89; cf. Lüdemann, "Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule," 326–27.

[58] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 20–21 n. 14; cf. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 28 n. 69. Born in Augsburg, Troeltsch was the only exception.

[59] See Horst Renz, "Thesen zur Erlangung der theologischen Lizentiatenwürde an der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen 1888–1893," in *Untersuchungen zur Biographie und Werkgeschichte*, ed. idem and Graf, 291–305; Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 16 n. 3.

[60] Graf, "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät,'" 289.

school. Congealing only over decades, this cohort argued the following: (1) early Christianity does not merely continue the Old Testament but evinces other roots as well (contra Ritschl); (2) diasporic Judaism and "Hellenistic" religiosity number among these sources; (3) the New Testament demands evaluation alongside other early Christian literature; (4) religion comprises not only systematic or doctrinal theology but also "irrational" experience and piety; (5) apocalyptic, eschatological, and pneumatological conceptions require further study, and religious practice, or the cult, constitutes a central element of religion; (6) historiography must concern itself with pre-literary forms, genres, or material; and (7) both Testaments, Old and New, require the same kind of examination as all other religious texts.[61] Such shared convictions bound all these scholars together, at least as their careers progressed. Indeed, this particular band of *Göttinger* spent considerable time and effort in defending its existence – and in writing its own history as well. Yet neither across the humanities nor in their own domain of study was this school nearly as distinct as they – or many a later historiographer – may, perhaps, have hoped.

"The" History of Religion School was in fact but one of many: doubtless, school was in session elsewhere. If, as Klatt suggests, the seminal ideas of Albert Eichhorn (1856–1926) fell, for Gunkel's own development, on fields already furrowed by de Lagarde and Harnack, the process of dissemination beyond the walls of Göttingen was very much the same.[62] Indeed, this particular *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* may well have scattered its seeds of theory and practice all across the German Empire – as its members proceeded to spread among any number of institutions – but they did so upon soils quite well tilled by then.[63] Scholars laboring away in many fields of knowledge had already tacked towards the study of religion even before the harder turn to religion ordered by the school of the Georgia Augusta. Such interest, or fascination, blazed in Leipzig (Saxony), Bonn (Prussia), and Tübingen (Württemberg), to list these institutions by their

---

[61] Rudolph, "Eduard Nordens Bedeutung für die frühchristliche Religionsgeschichte," 90–94; cf. also idem, "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule," in *Encyclopedia of Religion,* 2nd ed., ed. Lindsay Jones, 15 vols. (Detroit: Macmillan, 2005), 11:7706–7709; idem, *Geschichte und Probleme der Religionswissenschaft* (Studies in the History of Religions 53; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 412–20.

[62] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 24.

[63] In his survey of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, Alf Özen extends the scope chronologically and geographically, but he still seems to cast the Georgia Augusta and its graduates as the epicenter of *Religionsgeschichte* within the germanophone sphere more broadly (idem, "Die Göttinger Wurzeln der 'Religionsgeschichtliche Schule,'" in *Die "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule". Facetten eines theologischen Umbruchs*, ed. Gerd Lüdemann [Studien und Texte zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule 1; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1996], 23–64). Özen distinguishes between the Albert Eichhorn coterie (1884–1888), the development of circles(!) interested in the history of religion across Germany together with the break with Ritschlians (1890–1897/98), and the separation from the Ritschlians (1898–1903) with the formation of an independent entity, i. e., the "History of Religions School."

status at the time.[64] At the risk of data inundation, a detailed, textured portrait of similar pursuits will show at least a partial precedent for Gunkel's own work on "religion," documenting how he and his cohort were not only part of a longer tradition but also part of a larger shift. Both Gunkel and Göttingen may evanesce against this background, but that is precisely the point.

By the time Gunkel obtained his first position – as Halle *extraordinarius*, in 1894 – much had happened in Leipzig. Rudolph in particular has profiled the study of religion at the Alma Mater Lipsiensis.[65] As early as 1872, philosopher Rudolf Seydel (1835–1892) printed *Die Religion und die Religionen*, a series of lectures delivered before the German Protestant Association but devised over six years' teaching.[66] Notwithstanding their attachment to a set philosophical system, they conveyed respectable knowledge of distinct religious traditions and the requisite specialized literature. Indologist Bruno Lindner (1853–1930) likewise lectured on general religious history (*Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte*) and appended, in 1890, a lengthy essay entitled "Grundzüge der allgemeinen Religionswissenschaft auf geschichtlicher Grundlage" to the third edition of Zöckler's *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften* – to the volume on systematic theology, no less.[67] Furthermore, in 1885, father of *Völkerpsychologie* Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920) commenced his course on "Psychology of Language, Myth, and Custom (*Sitte*)." Apart from a single class, given by private docent Heinrich Goldhorn (1810–1874), in 1837, Leipzig's Faculty of Theology offered no single sequence on anything approaching a general or comparative religious history until Alfred Jeremias (1864–1935) initiated such a program, in the year 1906. Besides such comparative ventures, more specialized analyses of specific religious traditions had already long surfaced in many a Leipzig philologist's work. Beginning in 1839, architect of *Arabistik* Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801–1888) lectured on Islam alongside the Quran. Though by then dismissed from Leipzig and assigned, instead, to Bonn, the classicist Otto Jahn (1813–1869) issued his famous essay, in 1855, "Über den Aberglauben des bösen Blicks bei den Alten," which Alan Dundes deems the starting point of modern inquiry into the evil

[64] Baumgarten, *Professoren und Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert*, 272.

[65] Kurt Rudolph, "Leipzig und die Religionswissenschaft," *Numen* 9, no. 1 (1962): 53–68 [repr. in idem, *Geschichte und Probleme der Religionswissenschaft*, 323–39]; see further idem, *Die Religionsgeschichte an der Leipziger Universität und die Entwicklung der Religionswissenschaft. Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte und zum Problem der Religionswissenschaft* (Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse 107/1; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

[66] Rudolf Seydel, *Die Religion und die Religionen. Vorträge gehalten im Deutschen Protestanten-Verein zu Leipzig* (Leipzig: Findel, 1872).

[67] Bruno Lindner, in H*andbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften in encyklopädischer Darstellung mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Entwicklungsgeschichte der einzelnen Disziplinen*, Vol. 3, *Systematische Theologie*, 3rd ed. (Munich: Beck, 1890), 565–673. Zöckler himself then added a section entitled "Die Religionen und die Religion (Heidentum und Offenbarung)" (ibid., 674–95).

eye.[68] Art historian Johannes Overbeck (1826–1895), moreover, produced his *Griechische Kunstmythologie* between 1871 and 1879, and also in the latter year, classicist Theodor Schreiber (1848–1912) submitted his habilitation project on Greek art and religious history. As yet another instance, in 1864 philologist Theodor Möbius (1821–1890) offered a course on Nordic mythology, while by the early 1890s Eugen Mogk (1854–1939) had started teaching Germanic myth on a regular basis, too. The year 1883 then saw publication of hymns from the Rig Veda, produced by Ernst Windisch (1844–1918).[69] In his 1891 second edition of Friedrich Mürdter's *Kurzgefaßte Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens nach den Keilschriftdenkmälern*, the acclaimed assyriologist Delitzsch revised sections devoted to Assyrian and Babylonian religion – with his 1881 *Wo lag das Paradies?* already portending the kind of diffusionary questions that would later provoke controversy.[70] Though he explicitly avoided any overt comparative venture in his 1884 *Babylonische Bußpsalmen*, Delitzsch's student and successor Heinrich Zimmern (1862–1931) delivered his inaugural lecture, in 1894, on the origins of the creation story in Genesis.[71] His contribution to Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* appeared that same year as well, and shortly thereafter, in 1896, Zimmern printed the first installment of his *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion*.[72] Yet neither Göttingen nor Leipzig had a corner on the market of religion's exploration.

The history of religion had a history at Bonn. Here, too, a stout body of research had soared long before Gunkel landed his first position, in 1894. Inaugural professor of "Greek philology and various disciplines of classical studies," head of the university bibliotheca, and director of the museum for ancient art – all at the newly-founded Rhine (later Rhenish Friedrich Wilhelm) University – Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker (1784–1868) published his *Griechische Götterlehre*

---

[68] Otto Jahn, "Über den Aberglauben des bösen Blicks bei den Alten," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Classe* 7 (1855): 28–110; Alan Dundes, "Wet and Dry, the Evil Eye: An Essay in Indo-European and Semitic Worldview," in idem, *Interpreting Folklore* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), 93–133, at 96 [repr. in idem, ed., *The Evil Eye: A Casebook* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 257–312]; Theodor Schreiber, *Apollon Pythoktonos. Ein Beitrag zur griechischen Religions- und Kunstgeschichte* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1879).

[69] Ernst Windisch, *Zwölf Hymnen des Rigveda mit Sāyaṇa's Commentar* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1883).

[70] Cf. Friedrich Mürdter, *Kurzgefaßte Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens nach den Keilschriftdenkmälern, Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart: Bunder 1882); Friedrich Delitzsch, ed., *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens* (Calw: Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1891), which omits the subtitle *Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Alten Testaments*; Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo Lag das Paradies? Eine biblisch-assyriologische Studie* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1881), see, e. g., 150–55.

[71] The title was "Die Herkunft des biblischen Schöpfungsberichtes."

[72] Heinrich Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion. Erste Lieferung: Die Beschwörungstafeln Šurpu* (Assyriologische Bibliothek 12; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896).

between 1857 and 1862.[73] In 1868, classical philologist and Welcker student Usener then issued his landmark essay "Kallone."[74] Although his *Götternamen. Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung* would not tower until 1896, its foundations already stood firm in the early 1870s, based on preparatory labors.[75] Indeed, Momigliano has described Usener, for a time, as "the guiding spirit of the study of religion," and Hugo Greßmann (1877–1927) himself would refer to a "working partnership" (*Arbeitsgemeinschaft*) between Göttingen's *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* and the "School of Usener."[76] Usener's own student and eventual son-in-law Albrecht Dieterich (1866–1908) wrote an 1888 Bonn dissertation on Greek magical papyri and their relationship to earlier religious concepts and older hymns and prayers.[77] Three years later, he published *Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des spätern Altertums* and another two thereafter *Nekyia. Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse*.[78] At the suggestion of onetime theologian and *ordinarius* of oriental languages Georg Freytag (1788–1861), moreover, the brilliant Abraham Geiger (1810–1874) composed a Latin prize-winning essay on the Quran's Jewish sources, in 1832, which he published the next year as *Was hat Mohamed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen* and submitted for a doctorate in Marburg.[79] The Norwegian Christian Lassen

[73] See Adolf Köhnken, "Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker (1784–1868)," *Gymnasium* 97 (1990): 97–103.

[74] Hermann Usener, "Kallone," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* n.s. 23 (1868): 316–77 [repr. in idem, *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 4, *Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913), 1–93].

[75] Roland Kany, "Hermann Usener as Historian of Religion," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 6 (2004): 159–76, at 164; see further Antje Wessels, *Ursprungszauber. Zur Rezeption von Hermann Useners Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 51; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003).

[76] Arnaldo Momigliano, "Hermann Usener," *History and Theory* 21, no. 4, Beiheft 21: *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1982): 33–48, at 46; Greßmann, *Albrecht Eichhorn und Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, 28–29. Kany maintains, "Usener's works, even if many of them seem preoccupied with detail, were conceived of as contributions to a general theory about the development of all religions and the forms of thought occurring in them" ("Hermann Usener as Historian of Religion," 161). Citation practices across such scholarly spheres merit far more exploration: cf., e. g., Rudolph, "Eduard Nordens Bedeutung für die frühchristliche Religionsgeschichte," 95–96.

[77] Albrecht Dieterich, *Prolegomena ad papyrum magicam Musei Lugdunensis Batavi* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1888); for an overview of the work, see Richard Wünsch, "Albrecht Dieterich," repr. in Albrecht Dieterich, *Kleine Schriften,* ed. Richard Wünsch (Leipzig: Teubner, 1911), ix–xlii at xii–xiv.

[78] Albrecht Dieterich, *Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des spätern Altertums: Festschrift Hermann Usener zur Feier seiner 25jährigen Lehrtätigkeit an der Bonner Universität* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1891); idem, *Nekyia. Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1893).

[79] Abraham Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen? Eine von der Königl. Preussischen Rheinuniversität gekrönte Preisschrift*, 1st ed. (Bonn: Baaden, 1833); 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Kaufmann, 1902) [repr. (Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1971) and with a prolegomenon by Friedrich Niewöhner (Jüdische Geistesgeschichte 5; Berlin: Parerga, 2005)] [ET: *Judaism and*

(1800–1876) – student of August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767–1845), who himself had produced editions and translations of such texts as *Bhagavad-Gita* and *Ramayana* – also incorporated religious aspects into his Indian history and ethnography, albeit tangentially.[80] Such diversity in subjects for the object of religion – from classics through indology and on to arabistics – suggests the strong attraction this domain of study had already exerted during Gunkel's formative period. Other corners of the *Kaiserreich* betrayed this interest, too.

In addition to Bonn and Leipzig, Eberhard Karls University boasted an august tradition of exploration into religion. The eminent – if once extremely controversial – "Tübingen School" did much to press the study of Christian origins into the sphere of historical research, even if its affiliates often maintained a clear theological profile, be it acknowledged or not.[81] Strauß, the (in)famous student of the famed Baur, mounted his milestone *Das Leben Jesu* in 1835–1836, with *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft* following half a decade later.[82] Eduard Zeller (1814–1908), his own student and eventual son-in-law, wrote extensively on philosophy and/of religion (concerning the Romans and Greeks especially) both during and beyond his time in Tübingen.[83] In a deep and textured assessment of the Tübingen School in general and Zeller in particular, Johannes Zachhuber has judged that his "overall project is predicated on an emphasis on free and critical historical *research*; a theological integration of philosophies of religion and history does not even come into view any longer."[84] Within the kingdom of classics,

---

Islam: A Prize Essay, trans. F. M. Young, "a member of the Ladies' League in aid of the Delhi Mission" (Madras: M. D. C. S. P. C. K. Press, 1898); repr., with a prolegomenon by Moshe Pearlman (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1970)]. The role of women involved in translation work merits further exploration: pp. 77 n. 41, 33 n. 36.

[80] See Adluri and Bagchee, *The Nay Science,* 40–48; cf. Benes, *In Babel's Shadow,* 200–04.

[81] See Hjelde, *Die Religionswissenschaft und das Christentum*, esp. 67–69; cf. idem, "Die Geburt der Religionswissenschaften aus dem Geist der Protestantischen Theologie," in *Religion(en) deuten. Transformationen der Religionsforschung*, ed. Friedrich Wihelm Graf and Friedemann Voigt (Troeltsch-Studien n.s. 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 9–28.

[82] David Friedrich Strauß, *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Osiander, 1835–36); idem, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Osiander/Stuttgart: Köhler, 1840–41).

[83] Before moving to Bern, in 1847, Zeller had published, for instance, *Platonische Studien* (Tübingen: Osiander, 1839); volumes one and two of *Die Philosophie der Griechen. Eine Untersuchung über Charakter, Gang und Hauptmomente ihrer Entwicklung* (Tübingen: Fues, 1844–46); "Über das Wesen der Religion," *Theologische Jahrbücher* 4, no. 1 (1845): 26–75 and 4, no. 2 (1845): 393–430 [repr. in idem, *Kleine Schriften,* Vol. 3, ed. Otto Leuze et al. (Berlin: Reimer, 1911), 71–152]; and "Über historische Kritik und ihre Anwendung auf die christlichen Religionsurkunden," *Theologische Jahrbücher* 5, no. 2 (1846): 288–321 [repr. in idem, *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 3, 153–87].

[84] Zachhuber, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany,* 122; see also Frederick C. Beiser, *The Genesis of Neo-Kantianism, 1796–1880* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 255–82. As Zachhuber continues, this theory of religion "was the direct result of his abandonment of Baur's idealist programme in favour of the neo-rationalist agenda characterized by a

Ernst Christian Walz (1802–1857), *exempli gratia*, offered classes titled "Roman Religion and Political Constitution" as well as "History of Ancient Religion, Mythology, and Art," while he also authored entries on mythology – including that on "Religio" – for August Pauly's (1796–1845) *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft in alphabetischer Ordnung*, which he eventually co-edited, too.[85] The Eberhardina Carolina was also home to none other than the lauded Rudolf von Roth (1821–1895), the Ewald student and Bruno Lindner teacher frequently hailed as the father of Vedic research. During his lengthy Tübingen tenure, he issued, inter alia, *Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda* (1846), *Über die Vorstellung vom Schicksal in der indischen Sprachweisheit* (1866), and *Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir* (1875). Von Roth wrote a series of essays on the history of religions, presented a lecture before the *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* on the high gods of Aryan peoples, and delivered his inaugural address on Indian scriptures, too.[86] Not only did he himself teach general religious history between 1849 and 1895 on a regular basis, but he even made the subject a compulsory field of study for the famous *Tübinger Stift*, beginning in 1867.[87]

Be it Tübingen, Bonn, or Leipzig, a range of geographic orbits and a span of intellectual spheres – far beyond the theological province of Göttingen – all indicate the kind of continuity, both synchronic and diachronic, that pervaded the German Empire when Gunkel began his career. If the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* of Göttingen shows, in the end, a dubious membership and a questionable

---

dualistic separation of nature and spirit and leading to analogous consequences for the understanding of history and of science" (*ad loc.*).

[85] Horst Junginger, *Von der philologischen zur völkischen Religionswissenschaft. Das Fach Religionswissenschaft an der Universität Tübingen von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ende des Dritten Reiches* (Contubernium 51; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999), 31; cf. *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft in alphabetischer Ordnung*, Vol. 6.2, ed. Christian Walz and Wilhelm Siegmund Teuffel (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1852), vii. The first edition of *Pauly* came in six volumes, between 1839 and 1849, the first volume undergoing a second edition, in two parts, between 1864 and 1866. In 1890, Georg Wissowa (1859–1931) then launched an extensive reedition of the work, dubbed the *Pauly-Wissowa*, which began to appear in 1893 and finished almost a century later, in 1980, with more than 80 volumes together with supplements and the like. An abridged version, *Der Kleine Pauly*, came in five volumes between 1964 and 1975. The life of this work has continued into the twenty-first century, with *Der Neue Pauly* and its English edition, *Brill's New Pauly*.

[86] Rudolf von Roth, "Zur Geschichte der Religionen, 1. Die Brahma-Religion," *Theologische Jahrbücher* 5, no. 3 (1846): 346–63; idem, "Zur Geschichte der Religionen, 2. Die Buddha-Religion," *Theologische Jahrbücher* 6, no. 2 (1847): 175–90; idem, "Zur Geschichte der Religionen, 3. Die Ormuzd-Religion," *Theologische Jahrbücher* 8, no. 2 (1849): 281–297; idem, "Die höchsten Götter der arischen Völker," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 6 (1852): 67–77; idem, "Ueber die heiligen Schriften der Arier," *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 2 (1857): 141–53.

[87] Junginger, *Von der philologischen zur völkischen Religionswissenschaft*, 24–28. Junginger suggests the idea for such a course came from Ewald originally. On the historical relationship between biblical criticism or academic theology and the formation of indology, see further Adluri and Bagchee, *The Nay Science*.

existence – at least when the putative members were at the Georgia Augusta – its standing as only a local movement and, furthermore, one distinct from the currents of academic inquiry surging elsewhere in the Germanies also comes into doubt. Germany was not, in fact, alone but rather even behind in the study of religion at this point in the nineteenth century.

4.3 Religion in the *Kaiserreich*, the *Kaiserreich* in Europe

All these works and workers, then, reflect the exploration of religion surrounding Gunkel's Göttingen, studies that would only proliferate through the end of the Great War. Though varying in data and not all comparative in nature, such researches represent a number of dimensions: the hoary history of religion's exploration, the rather long shadow cast by German romanticism, the heavy tilt towards classics in almost all historical projects, the philological drive of probes into the past, and the patronage system firmly in place institutionally across the *Kaiserreich*. These contributions also confirm Jonathan Smith's appraisal of linguistics and anthropology as the two "great nourishing stream[s] of the Comparative Religions method."[88] Such torrents ran across the *Kaiserreich* and through its neighbors, too. Still, certain dams could, and did, at times impede the flow.

Outside the German Empire, the study of religion goaded academic droves. The Low Countries, France, and Switzerland all built institutional folds – beyond the field of theology and, at least nominally, confessionalism – to accommodate such study.[89] From Strasbourg to Königsberg, however, institutionalization was pokey if not plodding. As late as 1899, the Philadelphian Jewish orientalist Morris Jastrow, Jr., (1861–1921) could lament Deutschland's dilatory development of

[88] Smith, "Adde Parvum Parvo Magnus Acervus Erit," 82.

[89] See, e.g., the essays in Arie Molendijk and Peter Pels, ed., *Religion in the Making: The Emergence of the Sciences of Religion* (Numen Book Series/Studies in the History of Religions 80; Leiden: Brill, 1998); those in Gerard Wiegers, ed., *Modern Societies & The Science of Religions*: *Studies in Honor of Lammert Leertouwer* (Numen Book Series/Studies in the History of Religions 95; Leiden: Brill, 2002); as well as those in Sigurd Hjelde, ed., *Man, Meaning, and Mystery: 100 Years of History of Religions in Norway. The Heritage of W. Brede Kristensen* (Numen Book Series/Studies in the History of Religions 87; Leiden: Brill, 2000); see further Arie L. Molendijk, *The Emergence of the Science of Religion in the Netherlands* (Numen Book Series/Studies in the History of Religions 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005); Marjorie Wheeler-Barclay, *The Science of Religion in Britain, 1860–1915* (Victorian Literature and Culture Series; Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010). Perhaps the most standard anglophone account is Eric J. Sharpe, *Comparative Religion: A History,* 2nd ed. (La Salle: Open Court, 1986); cf. Guy G. Stroumsa, "Richard Simon: From Philology to Comparison," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001): 89–107. For a briefer overview – in addition to those cited below – see Karl-Heinz Kohl, "Geschichte der Religionswissenschaft," in *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe,* Vol. 1, *Systematischer Teil*, ed. Hubert Cancik, Burkhard Gladigow, and Matthias Laubscher (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1988), 217–62, esp. 239–60; Rudolph, *Die Religionsgeschichte an der Leipziger Universität*, 9–36.

established research on religion – all the more given its deep impact on American institutions, "which are largely swayed by Germany's example."[90] Six years later still, the Canadian-born, Scottish-trained, and fleetingly American-employed Louis Henry Jordan (1855–1923) judged Teutonic ventures in comparative religion "exceedingly disappointing."[91] Similar frustration rose within the *Kaiserreich* itself. In 1901, the Würzburg Catholic indologist Edmund Hardy (1852–1904) composed a chronicle of inquiry for the first Germanic journal devoted to the subject – *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, founded in 1898 – where he stressed the great disservice done through a separation of historical and philosophical (i. e., empirical and theoretical) probes into religion.[92] Even in 1905, Germany could glory in over fifty professorships for oriental studies and yet swank none in comparative religion "under any name."[93]

When Germany did at last establish its first germane professorship, for "general history of religion and philosophy of religion," in 1910, the chair belonged to Berlin's Theology Faculty, and they imported a Dane to occupy the post: Edvard Lehmann (1862–1930), former student of the Dutch founding father Pierre

[90] Morris Jastrow, Jr., "The Historical Study of Religions in Universities and Colleges," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 20 (1899): 317–25, at 320; cf. also idem, *The Study of Religion* (London: Walter Scott, 1902), 56–57. Jastrow, for his part, described the historical study of religion as "the child of comparative philology and the foster child of archaeology" (idem, "The Historical Study of Religions," 319–20). His work still boasts great historiographic import.

[91] Louis Henry Jordan, *Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1905), 196–97, cf. 140–44; see also idem, "The History of Religions, and its Introduction into the German Universities," *Expository Times* 22, no. 5 (1911): 198–201; idem, "The Study of the History of Religions in the German Universities," *Expository Times* 24, no. 3 (1912): 136–39; see further idem, *Comparative Religion: Its Adjuncts and Allies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1915); idem, *Comparative Religion: A Survey of Its Recent Literature,* Vol. 1, *1900–1909*, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1920). These works remain indispensable for any history of the field. On Jordan the man, see Joseph M. Kitagawa, "The History of Religions at Chicago," in idem, *The History of Religions: Understanding Human Experience* (American Academy of Religion Studies in Religion 47; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 133–44, at 135; James Turner, *Religion Enters the Academy: The Origins of the Scholarly Study of Religion in America* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011), 62, 101–02 n. 14. Jordan actually divided the "Science of Religion" into three parts, which he ordered chronologically: "The History of Religions," "The Comparison of Religions ('Comparative Religion,' *strictly so called.*)," and "The Philosophy of Religion" (idem, *Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth*, 9, cf., e. g., 64); see the critique by, e. g., Henry Preserved Smith in "Recent Theological Literature. Books on the Science of Religion," *American Journal of Theology* 10, no. 4 (1906): 701–05, at 701–03.

[92] Edmund Hardy, "Zur Geschichte der vergleichenden Religionsforschung, 1–3," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 4 (1901): 45–66, 97–135, 193–228, at 225; cf. also idem, "Was ist Religionswissenschaft? Ein Beitrag zur Methodik der historischen Religionsforschung," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 1 (1898): 9–42. Pierre Daniel Chantepie de la Saussaye, among others, had drawn the same distinction in his essential *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Freiburg: Mohr [Siebeck], 1887–89), 1:6. Notably, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* was itself ruled by (classical) philology (cf. Rudolph, "Eduard Nordens Bedeutung für die frühchristliche Religionsgeschichte," 95; idem, *Die Religionsgeschichte an der Leipziger Universität*, 49–51).

[93] Sharpe, *Comparative Religion*, 125–26.

Daniel Chantepie de la Saussaye (1848–1920). That same year, Carl Clemen (1865–1940) exited Bonn's Faculty of Theology to fill a new associate position in its Faculty of Philosophy, commissioned to teach "the history of religion, systematic philosophy of religion, and history of ancient Christianity."[94] By contrast, the Swiss had instituted similar(ly ambiguous) positions in 1873; the Dutch, in 1877; and the French, in 1879.[95] Germany, that *ne plus ultra* of historicist scholarship, made far less history for itself in the institutionalization of research on religion.

This diversity in pace and nomenclature leads to that precarious murk and morass of religious studies' start. To follow Arie Molendijk and avoid "terminological niceties," the science (or "field") of religion has seen diverse denomination: from comparative religion, religious studies, and science of religion through history of religion, history of religions, and philosophy of religion to phenomenology of religion, psychology of religion as well as hierology and hierography – to cite only anglophone terms.[96] If these formal designations were very much in flux, their actual contents of study proved equally unstable. Debate surrounded everything from the proper location of chairs in institutional complexes through the coherence and consistency of methodological procedures across divergent sets of data to the confines of that data itself as well as the ultimate objective of such study. One rather common narrative describes the "secular" study of religion as a hard-won liberation from the "patronizing power of theology."[97] Sigurd Hjelde thus espies,

> The fact that contemporary religious studies (*Religionswissenschaft*) often views the *theological* tradition with skepticism and mistrust and seeks its own paternity, rather, in the realm of such *anthropological* fields as ethnology, psychology, or sociology probably has to do with its own understanding of its history with a penchant as a process of "emancipation," by which it gradually liberated itself from the "tutelage" of such old authorities as theology or philosophy, surely theology most of all.[98]

---

[94] On Clemen, see, e. g., Ulrich Vollmer, "Carl Clemen (1865–1940) als Emeritus," *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 9, no. 2 (2001): 185–204; idem, "Carl Clemen und die iranische Religion," in *Religionswissenschaft im Kontext der Asienwissenschaften. 99 Jahre religionswissenschaftliche Lehre und Forschung in Bonn,* ed. Manfred Hutter (Religionen in der pluralen Welt: Religionswissenschaftliche Studien; Berlin: LIT, 2009), 99–111.

[95] Cf. Sharpe, *Comparative Religion*, 119–43.

[96] Arie L. Molendijk, "At the Cross-Roads: Early Dutch Science of Religion in International Perspective," in *Man, Meaning, and Mystery*, ed. Hjelde, 19–56, at 19 n. 4; cf. idem, *The Emergence of the Science of Religion in the Netherlands*, 1 n. 1, 17; idem, "Introduction," in *Religion in the Making*, 1–27, at 13–14.

[97] Molendijk, "At the Cross-Roads," 21.

[98] Hjelde, "Die Geburt der Religionswissenschaften aus dem Geist der Protestantischen Theologie," 10; cf. already George Foot Moore's critical characterization of the Jordanian conception of comparative religion as "emancipat[ion]" from related fields of scholarship: idem, review of *Comparative Religion: Its Adjuncts and Allies*, by Louis Henry Jordan, *Harvard Theological Review* 9, no. 4 (1916): 431–33, at 431.

Whatever their relationship (then and now alike), religion as a recognizably independent, institutionally validated domain of academic inquiry rose only on the other side of "depoliticization" and "deconfessionalization."[99] The study of the study of religion thus remains contentious. To enumerate perhaps the most controversial historiographic factors in the form of (patently simplified) binaries, such negotiation in the disciplinization of religious studies involved (1) continuity and discontinuity – diachronically and synchronically – with other subjects of study (such as myth[100]) as well as the methods deployed to do so, (2) theology (crypto- or otherwise) versus secular/non-confessional religious studies in all their personal, institutional, methodological, and categorical entanglement, (3) the comparative enterprise against specialized research, (4) theoretical rumination as opposed to empirical investigation, (5) religion as but a single essence merely manifest multiply – with Christianity most often seen at the apex – or a plain description of variable albeit similar phenomena, (6) historical inquiry over and against systematic (or dogmatic) representation, and (7) varied patterns and arrangements of such multifarious aspects in different national settings. All these elements were settled, or soothed in the very least, not only within but also across boundaries of nation, tongue, and practice in the course of the nineteenth century. What underlay them all was a rather persistent appeal to that coveted *Wissenschaftlichkeit*, or scientificity. However deep and twisted its roots reached in the past, a distinct, definable field marked by institutional independence only came with time – all the slower in the *Kaiserreich*.

Amidst this very matrix rose "the" *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* of Göttingen. Most accounts in the history of biblical and theological scholarship have overlooked these developments in not only the longer but also the wider exploration of religion, in the German-speaking lands as elsewhere. Such neglect comes as a consequence of that internal perspective so characteristic of the kind of histories written on theology and biblical studies. As Rudolph writes, however, "Essentially, the *R*[*eligionsgeschichtliche*] *S*[*chule*] drew conclusions into the theological realm that had resulted from prior developments in history, Near Eastern studies, history of religion, and ethnology."[101] Yet not only now but also then, scholars writing on this school created a narrative of almost solely internal causation. An otherwise enthusiastic advocate for diffusionary study, Gunkel ostensibly failed

[99] Hjelde has written on a "deconfessionalization" (*Entkonfessionalisierung*) (idem, *Die Religionswissenschaft und das Christentum*, 132), while Tomoko Masuzawa has described a "depoliticization" (idem, *The Invention of World Religions or, How European Universalism was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005], 20). Molendijk and Graf have referred to a more recent dedisciplinization (*Entdisziplinierung*) of religion across academic inquiry (cf. Molendijk, "Der Kampf um die Religion in der Wissenschaft," in *Religion[en] deuten*, ed. Graf and Voigt, 29–49, at 30).

[100] On the long tradition of myth's allure in Germany, an element not to be underestimated, see Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany*.

[101] Rudolph, *Geschichte und Probleme der Religionswissenschaft*, 412.

to appreciate the irony present in his own eventual insistence that the goings-on in Göttingen comprised "an entirely inner-theological movement."[102] The impetus for such insistence issued from Kittel's counterclaim – or, rather, recognition – that archaeological excavation, textual discoveries, and comparative religion (*Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte*) had all catalyzed "a" *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* within the province of theology, even if the third component in this series was relatively latent in its impact.[103] Kittel may have eschewed specific names, but he clearly conjured up that noted "Göttingen clique" – an epithet, less than full affectionate, coined by Wellhausen for Gunkel and his confrères.[104] In a curt retort to Kittel, Gunkel asserted with confidence, "When we wrote 'Religionsgeschichte' on our banner back in those days, we did not imagine a 'history of *religions*' but a 'history of *the biblical religion*.'"[105] His field of study, then, was the history of religion – with an emphasis on the singular.

This specific spat ensued in 1922, decennia after the formative days in Göttingen. Spitfire that he was, Gunkel deployed his usual polemics, but the pertinacity likely resulted, at least in part, from his undying certitude that others deemed him an interloper. As Sharpe observes, again, "At all events, it was virtually axiomatic [in Germany] that a man could not be a *Religionsgeschichtlicher* and a respectable theologian at one and the same time. It was equally in doubt, in the eyes of some, whether a man could be a *Religionsgeschichtler* of the wider variety and a scholar at the same time."[106] The internal explanation provided by Gunkel and his colleagues justified their place in the faculty or discipline of theology, on the one hand, and that of their research agendas, on the other. Despite their interest in the diffusion and the inner, personal experience of the past, neither the intellectual trends spreading across the human sciences nor their own curiosities seemed to supply an adequate warrant for the kind of inquiry into religion they wanted to explore. Certainly, local dynamics at the Georgia Augusta may well have sparked the movement – an especial reaction to the unavoidable Ritschl – yet the necessary kindling had long lain at the ready.

---

[102] Hermann Gunkel, "Die Richtungen der alttestamentlichen Forschung," *Die Christliche Welt* 36, no. 1 (1922): 64–67, at 66; cf. also idem, "Was will die 'religionsgeschichtliche' Bewegung?"

[103] Kittel, "Die Zukunft der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft," esp. 87–88. On this specific exchange, see further Rudolf Smend, "Richtungen. Ein Rückblick auf die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 97 (2000): 259–75, at 260–66.

[104] Wellhausen to Enno Littmann, December 21, 1915, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 630.

[105] Gunkel, "Die Richtungen der alttestamentlichen Forschungen," 66; cf. idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, v–vi.

[106] Sharpe, *Comparative Religion*, 126.

4.4 German Scholarship at the *Fin de Siècle*

Neither Göttingen's History of Religion School in particular nor the drive towards a science of religion in general reflected, on its own, the sizable shifts that coincided across the *Kaiserreich* at the *fin de siècle*. Far beyond the field of biblical scholarship, other disciplines throughout the human sciences betrayed similar challenges to the questions posed, materials studied, methods deployed, and values endorsed. These transformations, however, revealed on the level of academic inquiry still greater movements in social and cultural history. Indeed, historians of the intellectual, cultural, and social variety have long analyzed the seismic shifts that shook Germany on its own and Europe as a whole at the turn of the twentieth century. The human sciences were by no means exempt from these convulsions, nor were they merely passive registers of such activity. When telling, much later, the story of a *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* entirely theological in nature and mostly self-contained, Gunkel narrated a history quite different from those he usually recounted for antiquity.

With her defining erudition, Marchand has fashioned a crucial matrix for understanding these transformations in scholarship, including biblical research. Chronicling the history of, in fact, three generations – romantic, anti-romantic, and neo-romantic – and employing the so-called Second Oriental Renaissance as a major device for the narrative, Marchand gives an account of what she calls the "furor orientalis," which erupted in full force at the turn of the twentieth century. Her own description merits reproduction in full:

> The emergence in the later 1880s and 1890s of what I will call the *furor orientalis* is a complex phenomenon, both a generational attack on the philhellenic cultural institutions of the Reich, and an attempt to create both a new sort of humanism and a new hierarchy of the disciplines. It had numerous spokespersons, some of whom were what we might call cultural relativists, content to create a rough parity between West and East, some of whom were romantics, seeking a new religion, and some of whom were racist fanatics, eager to give Germany a purer past, present and future. What made the articulation of these new world views possible was: first of all, the specialized orientalist scholarship of the previous half-century (and the next 30 years); secondly, an emerging generational revolt which seriously threatened the status of the *Gymnasium*, and classical scholarship with them; thirdly, the onset of colonization and the new friendship established between the Kaiser and the Sultan; and finally, a neoromantic revival which made things religious, irrational, primitive and exotic once more highly appealing.[107]

Now, Marchand herself has scrutinized this phenomenon in its multifaceted manifestations – from the neo-Creuzerian spirit that reanimated classics through a *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* that distraught theology to the Panbabylonian

[107] Marchand, "Philhellenism and the *Furor Orientalis*," *Modern Intellectual History* 1, no. 3 (2004): 331–58, at 339; cf. idem, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, esp. 212–51; see further idem, "Popularizing the Orient," *Intellectual History* 17, no. 2 (2007): 175–202.

assyriology and Schopenhauerian indology that undermined both establishment disciplines – which makes rehearsal here superfluous. Yet a short review of the kind of controversies that not only troubled classical, assyriological, and indological studies but also drew a strong response from the scholarly powers that be should indicate the rather ordinary nature of Göttingen's History of Religion School, no matter how extraordinary (or, perhaps, out of the ordinary) it may have seemed at the time. Indeed, Gunkel and his cohort were not alone in their attraction to the East.

A group "whose name is sufficient to drive usually calm scholars to a frenzy of vituperation," the Panbabylonians were once pan-firebrands, igniting a veritable frenzy throughout academia's halls and across the parlor rooms of *Bildungsbürgertum* – Jewish and Christian alike, both liberal and conservative.[108] The thesis advanced by these scholars represented a radical diffusionary inquiry insofar as they explained the perceived similarity of myths and cultural patterns worldwide through the spread and adaptation of ancient Mesopotamian astrology. True to their general distrust of comparative material, non-canonical sources, (explicit) theoretical interventions, and methodological innovation, mid-century germanophone philologists had proved anything other than quick to accept even the decipherment of cuneiform, just as they had been with the decryption of Egyptian hieroglyphs, the advent of a "science of religion," and the rise of archaeological excavations.[109] If the Ewald protégé and pioneer in assyriological research Schrader had confined himself to preliminaries, the next generation of cuneiformists not only extended such critical analysis but also commenced a grander, more ambitious synthesis. Hugo Winckler – the Paul to Eduard Stucken's (1865–1936) Jesus – did much to promote the expansion of the Panbabylonian cause. Other apostles included, inter alia, Alfred Jeremias, Peter Jensen (1861–1936), and Felix Ernst Peiser (1862–1921). Most active, or at

[108] Smith, *Imagining Religion*, 26.

[109] A rule-confirming exception, Georg Friedrich Grotefend (1775–1853) offered a substantial advance in the decipherment of cuneiform already in 1802, but, in the lamenting words of Archibald Henry Sayce (1845–1933), "… the learned world looked askance at the discoveries of the young Latinist. The science of archæology was still unborn, and Oriental philologists were unable even to understand the inductive method of the decipherer. The Academy of Göttingen refused to print his communications, and it was not until 1815 that they appeared in the first volume of the History of his friend [Arnold Hermann Ludwig] Heeren, who, being untrammelled by the prejudices of Oriental learning, had been one of the earliest to accept his conclusions. For a whole generation the work of decipherment was allowed to sleep" (A. H. Sayce, *The Archæology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions* [London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907], 12–13; cf., more recently, Ali Mousavi, *Persepolis: Discovery and Afterlife of a World Wonder* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012], 120–22). Wellhausen expressed an interest in the publication of his work: see Wellhausen to Justi, May 18, 1893, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 305–06; cf. also Wellhausen to Carl Bezold, October 22, 1903, in ibid., 424–25. Kind thanks go to Harald Samuel for bringing Grotefend to my attention.

issue, in the 1880s and 1890s, the Panbabylonian enterprise helped destabilize both the distinctiveness of Israel and the genealogy of "Western" civilization in antique Greece and Rome through its forceful claims of dependency on another, still more ancient people.[110] Hailing Babylonia the real inventor of "civilization," this cadre claimed that Mesopotamia had, in fact, bequeathed a whole conceptual system unto the rest of the world. Not only did such an assertion grant a different people a priority and thus, implicitly, superiority, but it even assigned the honor to that very people which the Bible records as the archenemy of Israel. The contention, in turn, imputed that people's interpreters with a greater significance. If Israelites and Greeks were no longer the chosen peoples, then theologians and classicists were no longer the chosen experts. The blaze burned long and bright. The more public affrays may have abated by 1905, but the debate continued to smolder from such incendiaries.[111] Both the American Harvard professor Crawford Howell Toy (1836–1919) and the Canadian Bryn Mawr semitist George Aaron Barton (1859–1942) sharply censured the "school" still at the end of the aughts.[112] About a decade later, Max Weber suggested the Panbabylonian flame had finally extinguished.[113] As "a quintessential expression of the furor orientalis," the Panbabylonians displayed "the tendency to adopt a winner-takes-all approach to the study of cultural origins; the preference for oriental paganism over the more established cultures of the book; and a generational critique of positivist

[110] See especially Daniel Gold, *Aesthetics and Analysis in Writing on Religion: Modern Fascinations* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003), 145–58. Delitzsch and the almost legendary *Babel-Bibel-Streit* constituted an analytically distinct yet frequently associated occurrence, one that wrought a similar rupture in the common imagination of antiquity; cf. pp. 1–3 above.

[111] On the timeline of such controversies, cf. Marchand, "Philhellenism and the *Furor Orientalis*," 341–46; cf. idem, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 236–51.

[112] Crawford Howell Toy ended his rather long review with disappointment: "Even when a true religious fact is recognized by the theory … it is clothed in so bizarre a costume of extravagant mythical fancy that it fades into a dogma of the 'Ancient Oriental Lore' and has no power to kindle the imagination or give comfort to the soul" (idem, "Panbabylonianism," *Harvard Theological Review* 3, no. 1 [1910]: 47–84, at 84; cf. idem, "Errata: Panbabylonianism," *Harvard Theological Review* 3, no. 4 [1910]: n.p.). George Aaron Barton, for his part, was more biting: "Certain scholars, too, never find originality in the field where they are working. […] Originality, like the malaria in our western states in former days, is always in the next town to the one in which the inquirer happens to be. In estimating these recent words on ancient Israel, this foible of investigators must be borne in mind" (idem, "Recent German Theories of Foreign Influences in the Bible," *The Biblical World* 31, no. 5 [1908]: 336–47, at 347; cf. idem, "The Astro-Mythological School of Biblical Interpretation," *The Biblical World* 31, no. 6 [1908]: 433–44; cf. also idem, "On the Babylonian Origin of Plato's Nuptial Number," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 29 [1908]: 210–19).

[113] Weber remarked, "Today, a serious scholar would hardly attempt to deduce the religion of the Israelites from Babylonian astrological cults and secret priestly knowledge" (Weber, *Ancient Judaism*, trans. Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale [Glencoe: Free Press, 1952 (1917–19)], 427–28).

practices."[114] Like the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* of Göttingen, however, they, too, were only one expression.

In the empire of classics, where "Wilamops" long reigned supreme, certain menacing forces were successfully held at bay.[115] As *avant-garde* and atheistic as he may have liked to think himself, the powerful Wilamowitz sought to sentinel the world carefully constructed by high liberalism from any method or datum that might decivilize either modern Germans or those of antiquity – that is, of course, the Greeks. Ventures in comparison, searches for religion, inquiries into myth, analyses of folklore, and analogies by ethnology were all driven to the margins in not only his own analysis but also the institutional realms he ruled. Still at the end of his life, as late as the 1930s, he famously announced, "I have no opinion about other peoples; I know the Greeks."[116] Wilamowitz had, in fact, adumbrated this sentiment already six decennia prior, at the start of his career. Indeed, he had imposed such limitations on the study of classical antiquity when he upbraided *The Birth of Tragedy* by Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900), deriding, "Schopenhauerian philosophy, Wagnerian music, and even Nietzschean philology is precisely now the mystical wisdom of the hierophant!"[117] As Michael Stephen Silk and Joseph Peter Stern have synopsized, "It is not easy to summarize what Wilamowitz objected to in *B*[*irth of*] *T*[*ragedy*] except with the one word, *everything*."[118] However, threats to that established tradition of classical philology arose on other fronts as well. The "School of Usener," so beloved by Göttingen's *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, encountered equal opposition as they sought to ex-

[114] Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 237, 238.

[115] *Mops* being the designation for a pug as well as an epithet for an overweight person (so "pudge," "fatty," or the like), Nietzsche also referred to Wilamowitz as "Wilam ohne Witz" (i. e., "Wilam without Wit"): cf. Robert Edward Norton, *Secret Germany: Stefan George and His Circle* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 438.

[116] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1931–32), 1:288. Other such statements included, "I do not understand the languages from which the currently popular words taboo and totem, mana and orenda are borrowed, but I also consider it a valid method to hold myself to the Greeks and think Greekly about the Greeks" (ibid., 10) and, "Whoever speaks of totemism among the Hellenes only proves he knows nothing about them" (ibid., 24).

[117] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Future Philology! A Reply to Friedrich Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy*," trans. G. Postl, B. Babich, and H. Schmid, *New Nietzsche Studies* 4, no. 1/2 (2000): 1–33, at 15 [GO: *Zukunftsphilologie! eine erwidrung auf Friedrich Nietzsches "geburt der tragödie"* (*sic*) (Berlin: Borntraeger Brothers, 1872)]. Wilamowitz ended his review with little more clemency: "But let him step down from the lectern from which he is supposed to teach knowledge. He may gather tigers and panthers around his knees but not Germany's philologically interested youth who are supposed to learn – in the asceticism of self-denying work – to look everywhere for nothing but the truth, to free their judgment through deliberate devotion, so that classical antiquity will provide them with the unique and eternal insight that only the favor of the muses promises, and that only classical antiquity can guarantee in abundance and purity" (ibid., 24).

[118] M. S. Silk and J. P. Stern, *Nietzsche on Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 96.

pand the investigation of antiquity. Wilamowitz may have maintained a lifelong, though not uncomplicated, bond to his onetime Bonn advisor, yet his relationship to other students of Usener was relatively simple: dismissal, if not scorn.[119] The esteemed professor exhibited small appreciation for the kind of diffusionary study and inquiry into the exotic, the esoteric, and the irrational dimensions of religion that were implicated in the "Panorphism" and "Asclepius sham" he utterly reviled and associated with the work of Richard Reitzenstein (1861–1931) and Dieterich.[120] These campaigns into shrouded corners of the past confronted a certain orthodoxy. As Marchand formulates the controversy, "[t]he classicists who turned to *Religionsgeschichte* were not looking for ethical lessons, but rather for religious *experience* on the one hand, and a means to expose the superficiality of liberal classicism on the other."[121] Joining forces with the old guard, Wilamowitz adamantly opposed the foundation of a department for comparative religion at the University of Berlin, in the year 1909.[122] If the future of philology did not, in the end, belong to him and his noble company of high liberalism, the present of the *fin de siècle* could certainly seem to at times. Similar actions and reactions were elsewhere manifest as well.

Those spheres of erudition encompassed by indology also saw assaults upon convention. Though once united institutionally, in chairs, and personally, in scholars themselves, that oriental philology which previously covered West and Central Asia (chiefly Semitics but also Persian and Turkish), on the one hand, and South Asia (Sanskrit and comparative grammar), on the other, had largely bifurcated by the 1880s. While the former further fragmented into the specialties of biblical and non-biblical languages (mainly Hebrew and Arabic, respectively), the latter divided into the specialisms of Indo-European ("Indo-Germanic" or "Aryan") and of indology alongside iranology.[123] Amid these structural changes, diffusionary claims – ever the iconoclast's Excalibur – proceeded to undermine genealogies of a self-contained Western, Christian civilization. The analytical sword could cut in two directions. One series of arguments weakened a direct

[119] On Wilamowitz's relationship to Usener, see, inter alia, William M. Calder, III, "Why Did Wilamowitz Leave Bonn? The New Evidence," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 130 (1987): 366–84; cf. idem, "Three Unpublished Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 11, no. 2 (1970): 139–66, at 144; idem, "Wilamowitz to Zeller: Two Letters," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 19, no. 2 (1978): 177–84, at 181 n. 21; see further Momigliano, "Hermann Usener," 35–36; Wessels, *Ursprungszauber,* 7 n. 3. Not all of Usener's students would go in the direction of *Religionsgeschichte*: see Marchand, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism," 147.

[120] See Albert Heinrichs, "'Der Glaube der Hellenen'. Religionsgeschichte als Glaubensbekenntnis und Kulturkritik," in *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren*, ed. William M. Calder, III, Hellmut Flashar, and Theodor Lindken (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985), 263–305.

[121] Marchand, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism," 146.

[122] Ibid., 145–46.

[123] Cf. Wokoeck, *German Orientalism*, esp. 144–45; Mangold, *Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft"*, esp. 155–68; Hanisch, *Die Nachfolger der Exegeten*, esp. 21–29.

connection between the Testaments Old and New, through apparent borrowing from the Buddha or Zoroaster. Another set of statements served to secure the bond of India and Europe – the Teutonic tribes especially – through the tie of Christian and Aryan religion, which usually came at the cost of links to Semitic (Jewish, Near Eastern) or classical (Greek, Roman) culture. Each, in its own way, therefore threatened well-established assumptions on Christian history itself.

The bourgeoning study of Buddhism continued to unravel these ties. Indologist Hermann Oldenberg (1854–1920) may have maintained the methods and the narrative of high liberal historicist philology in his *Buddha. Sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde* of 1881 – treating sources internal to the tradition, eschewing comparative ventures, and avoiding genealogical questions – but philosopher Seydel pursued precisely those points of contact that Oldenberg had so reverently left aside.[124] He poked the bruise of potential diffusion in his own work, published the following year beneath the rather revealing title *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha-Sage und Buddha-Lehre mit fortlaufender Rücksicht auf andere Religionskreise untersucht*.[125] Still others sought a middle ground. Indo-Europeanist Windisch and theologian Pfleiderer, for example, admitted such parallels, too, but stopped short of claiming any direct dependence, deferring, instead, to a common tradition for explanation of similitude.[126] Besides buddhology, efforts in iranology could sever the bond between the Testaments. Through several technical studies, Martin Haug (1827–1876) had assigned the Gathas of the Avesta to none other than Zoroaster (aka Zarathustra) and claimed the prophet's own theology had already included heaven and

---

[124] In addition to Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 270–79, see, inter alia, Perry Myers, *German Visions of India, 1871–1918*: *Commandeering the Holy Ganges during the Kaiserreich* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). In 1914, Richard Garbe (1857–1927) investigated the same question of borrowing in his *Indien und das Christentum. Eine Untersuchung der religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1914).

[125] Rudolf Seydel, *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha-Sage und Buddha-Lehre mit fortlaufender Rücksicht auf andere Religionskreise untersucht* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1882).

[126] Otto Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1902), 1:411–12 [ET: *Primitive Christianity: Its Writings and Teachings in Their Historical Connections*, 4 vols., trans. W. Montgomery (Theological Translation Library; London: Williams & Norgate, 1906–11), 2:108–09]; cf. idem, *Religion und Religionen* (Munich: Lehmann, 1906), 133 [ET: *Religion and Historic Faiths*, trans. Daniel A. Huebsch (New York: Huebsch, 1907), 158]; Ernst Windisch, *Māra und Buddha* (Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 15/4; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1895), esp. 218–19; idem, *Buddha's Geburt und die Lehre von der Seelenwanderung* (Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 26/2; Leipzig: Teubner, 1908), 195–222, which offers a then contemporary overview of research on the subject. On Pfleiderer's program, see Reinhard Leuze, *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte. Der Weg Otto Pfleiderers* (Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, Münchener Monographien zur historischen und systematischen Theologie 6; Munich: Kaiser, 1980).

hell, resurrection of the body, immortality of the soul, and even monotheism.[127] If iranologist Friedrich von Spiegel (1820–1905) found, in the early 1870s, bilateral borrowing between Persians and Israelites, Bousset argued for Jewish dependence on the "Iranian-Zarathustrian" religion.[128] De Lagarde also did his part to raise the Persians over the Jews, as witnessed in his study of calendrical systems.[129] Perhaps predictably so, some defenders of the faith employed the borrowed-but-better rebuttal in their case for Christianity: whatever the historical relationship, they contended, Christ eclipsed the Buddha or Zarathustra. In fact, even devoted experts of these languages and literatures could come to the Christian defense with the tools of specialized scholarship, from Catholic orientalist Joseph Dahlmann (1861–1930) through sanskritist Leopold von Schroeder (1851–1920) to historian of religion Hackmann.

While some indological studies undermined the isolation of Jewish–Christian history by exploring outside influence, other explorations realigned Christian origins with specifically non-Semitic cultures. Paul Deussen (1845–1919), the celebrated sanskritist, Schopenhauer enthusiast, and famous friend of Nietzsche, implied this very program in the provisionary sketch of his 1894 tome *Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanischad's*. He started with a distinction of cultural spheres (*Kulturkreise*) – Indian, West Asian (Semitic), and Greco-Roman (classical) – and asserted Zoroastrian origins for essential New Testament ideas, mediated by the Jews who were subject to the Achaemenid Empire.[130] Marchand observes, again, how Deussen

---

[127] Martin Haug, *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsees*, 1st ed. (Bombay: Bombay Gazette, 1862), esp. 300–14; cf. idem, *Die fünf Gâthâ's oder Sammlungen von Liedern und Sprüchen Zarathustra's, seiner Jünger und Nachfolger*, 2 vols. (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft; Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1858–1860); see further J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *The Western Response to Zoroaster* (Ratanbai Katrak Lectures 1956; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958), 20–21. As Marchand discerns, " … with the general acceptance (at least in German academic circles) of Wellhausen's periodization of Old Testament texts and characterization of early Israelite history by the late 1880s, it became possible to argue for a greater degree of Iranian influence on 'late' Jewish thought. Wellhausen had shown that the early period was one of polytheism and this-worldliness, of little speculative thought and primitive rituals rather than well-developed ethical codes. His late dates for the prophets and some of the Psalms opened the way for the next generation to credit the Persians with having given Judaism the idea of immortality of the soul, of salvation, and even of monotheism" (idem, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 281).

[128] Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903), esp. 448–93.

[129] Paul de Lagarde, *Purim. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Religion* (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 34, Philologisch-historische Klasse 3; Göttingen: Dieterich, 1887).

[130] Paul Deussen, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen*, Vol. 1.1, *Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanischad's* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1894), 8–12, 16.

hoped, above all, to use Schopenhauer and Indian philosophy to clean up Christianity, rather than to denigrate the Jews. But his need to contrast a pristine, authocthonous (*sic*), primeval India with the elements in Christianity he found problematic or distasteful culminated in the caricaturing of "Semitic Realism" and its complete opposition to Indo-Aryan idealism.[131]

Drafted before the outbreak of the "furor," this blueprint outlined by Deussen would eventually find developers in the indologist von Schroeder and the teutonophile Houston Steward Chamberlain (1855–1927), both of whom emphasized a more pristine autonomy and originality further east.[132] The explorations of indology in this period could, at times, include not only questions of cultural or intellectual history but also incorporate biological, even racial elements. As Heschel has demonstrated, "starting in the 1890s, Jesus was the figure who combined the immanence of the Aryan of the East with the strength and racial purity of the German as exemplified in Teutonic myths."[133] She and many others have scrutinized the political potentialities – and, indeed, historical realities – of such research trajectories into the twentieth century, including their dissemination by popularizers and propagandizers. Specific to the question of contestations within the human sciences at the *fin de siècle*, however, the results of Indian and Iranian scholarship revealed the challenges posed by theses of diffusion, realignments of genealogy, and reconstructions of the past. The ancient past in general and that of Europe in particular proved mouldable indeed, a malleability tested by a new generation of scholars with different problems and solutions, with new theories and methods, with pressing stakes and interests.

If Gunkel followed a family tradition when he read theology in Göttingen and there converged with a wave of aspiring theologians when, as the next two chapters detail, he largely devoted himself to the study of religion, both the challenges faced institutionally and the interventions – thematically, methodologically, theoretically – in this object of inquiry itself rose with the changing tides across the

---

[131] Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 309. She continues, "Deussen was reducing both 'Christianity' and 'Indian philosophy' to purified and ultimately ahistorical forms, and defining them in such a way as to preclude the participation of Judaism and Islam, Egypt and China, the *Naturvölker* and the Slav, in the search for truth" (ibid.).

[132] Hence, the ever-quotable Marchand writes, "… there was no room in this history for an Old Testament that was, in the view of Schroeder and many of his Protestant contemporaries, narrowly provincial, materialist, legalistic, and riddled with historical errors and with ideas borrowed or stolen from other, older oriental cultures. Nor was there much room, really, for the *Naturvölker*, even for a person whose job title had once included 'general ethnology'; the peoples whose spiritual history counted were only those related by language – and blood – to 'us'" (ibid., 313–14).

[133] Susannah Heschel, *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 41; see further Colin Kidd, *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600–2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 168–202.

German Empire and beyond. Students of classics and indology, assyriology and theology increasingly interrogated the established wisdom of philhellenism, liberal historicism, and the Christian faith. While some researches added prologue to the Old Testament, uncovering still more ancient cultures and entertaining doubts about Israel's distinctiveness and originality, others added volumes to the single page that once separated the Testaments Old and New in their (usually Protestant) Bibles, which thereby called into question not only the novelty and essence of Christianity but also its indebtedness to Judaism. As the nineteenth century turned into the twentieth, all these currents beat more forcefully against the personages, disciplines, and institutions that had long sustained an historical narrative and a self-identity of the Christian West.

This wide-angle lens for the formation of this scholar and his scholarship ultimately conforms to historiographic principles none other than Gunkel himself had championed. Intended to complement the usual perspective of the standard, more narrow accounts of intellectual biography, the analysis has set his preoccupations and his passions, his objectives and his obstacles within a broader history of the humanities, displaying the grander continuity in his age and with his generation. In fact, the question of just how far to go for comprehension of the past – from chronology to geography, from transmission to diffusion – placed him at odds with many of his heroes. Several years later, Gunkel returned to the same issues at stake in his 1899 complaint against an "older school," exemplified by Wellhausen. Perhaps flagellating a moribund equine, the junior academician asserted, "With such remarks, Wellhausen sets himself in opposition to fundamental principles valid everywhere in historical science and recognized and followed even by him in other spheres." He continued, "Our cardinal conviction of history is that we are not in the position to understand a person, a time, a concept apart from their prehistory but that we can only speak of a real, living understanding once we know the history of their formation."[134] Gunkel proved himself true to this conviction as he progressed in his career. From formative Christianity through ancient Judaism to early Israel, he incorporated an expanding set of empirical data and growing kit of methodological tools. At the same time, his own convictions as a Protestant theologian compelled him to preserve a distinctly Christian view of the past. Gunkel may have criticized Wellhausen and others for stopping short of full historicization, yet he did the same when confronted with any number of challenges to the historical claims of his Christian faith. The religion of interest to Gunkel was, in the end, his own.

[134] Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 10–11.

Chapter Five

The World of Ancient Israel

As many historians are wont to do, Gunkel proceeded to recede in the course of his career. With respect to his material, he journeyed backwards – chronologically – from formative Christianity to early Judaism, from early Judaism to antique Israel, and from antique Israel to ancient Babylonia and Egypt. In fact, his academic enterprise consisted of reversal. Concerning his subject of study, Gunkel withdrew from text to author and went back, even further, from literary product to pre-literary production, *videlicet,* from written work to oral world. As for anthropology, he retreated from the modern to the primitive. Gunkel went astern, more fundamentally, from extant back to origins. In this way, he assumed principles and priorities from his own high liberal forebears but extended them to their logical, if, to them, at times unwelcome conclusions. Gunkel fought accretion on a somewhat different front: he carried the battle from meaning to experience. The pursuit of the past, however, was largely for the present: the recovery of inspired personages should help resolve a modern crisis.

Like the labors of Wellhausen, many a Bible scholar has extolled the work of Gunkel, though their celebrants often differ. In their accounts of biblical research, the Lutheran Old Testament specialist Henning Graf Reventlow has lauded, "One could say that Gunkel blazed new paths in every field in which he worked, and in many cases methodologically broke new ground," while the Reformed biblical theologian Hans-Joachim Kraus has eulogized – with words like "epoch-making" – "There is no single aspect of the Old Testament in which Gunkel did not break new paths for proper investigation."[1] Even across the pond, American biblical scholar – and Gunkel-devotee – James Muilenburg once addressed the Society of Biblical Literature and declared with little reluctance, as president, no less, "Gunkel has never been excelled in his ability to portray the spirit which animat-

[1] Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol. 4, *From the Enlightenment to the Twentieth Century*, 340; Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments,* 341, 342. Reventlow further avers, "One must, however, confess that his methodological approach has been almost completely forgotten in the present and overshadowed by a sort of return to Wellhausen in the form of the redaction history school" (ibid.). Even in the form of the university itself – Wellhausen's twice institutional home – Göttingen has reflected a similar return: its present professors of Hebrew Bible, Hermann Spieckermann and Reinhard Kratz, as well as their predecessors, Rudolf Smend and Lothar Perlitt, have all written, at times extensively, on Wellhausen's method and/or biography, whatever their own scholarly preferences and practices.

ed the biblical writers."[2] In fact, the pathfinding and groundbreaking by Gunkel expressly sought to pave a way to that very spirit captured in the Bible. No matter the field he studied or the way he took to do so, a lodestar guided him through all his inquiries into the past: namely, "biblical religion." As with Wellhausen, again, Gunkel felt misunderstood. But rather than a semitist with deep historical interests misplaced among theologians, Gunkel believed the usual occupations in the study of antiquity and theology needed themselves to be replaced: with a special focus on religion. Such a concentration, he contended, could renew and reunite not only the human sciences but also society more broadly.

Gunkel, too, moved fields in his career, from early Christianity through formative Judaism to ancient Israel and its neighbors, and his investigations of the past betrayed remarkable continuity in their ends and means as well. This historian of religion likewise maintained the same questions and concerns, the same principles and practices even as his material changed – drastically at times – in content or in form. Wherever his inquiries may have led him, the Bible remained his center of gravity. Furthermore, the fundamental theories and methods that would later come to characterize his innovative interventions in Hebrew Bible scholarship were already in force even before Gunkel redirected his specialization, when he still hoped to become a scholar of the New Testament. Whatever his object of inquiry, he bound together Israel and Christianity through a genealogy of religion that not only affirmed divine revelation in history but also suggested its continued significance for the German present. Even as he delved deeper into the pasts of other peoples, the distinctiveness of this genealogy was paramount: the broader he built the foundation of religion, the higher Christianity could tower. In this way, Gunkel may have opened biblical scholarship to newer sources or older religions, but he maintained a longer tradition in asserting the uniqueness – even supremacy – of that genealogy. Though certainly modified, the historical narrative he told and the operations he deployed ultimately betrayed a deep continuity with those of his predecessors, regardless of any conflict between the generations.

Whereas the last chapter located Gunkel in his world, this one positions his work on ancient Israel within the aggregate of his historiography. Now, any number of disciplinary histories, states of the art, and specialist handbooks have

---

[2] James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88, no. 1 (1969): 1–18, at 2; cf. also Oden, *The Bible Without Theology*, 30, 46–47. Gunkel also features as the hero in Ronald E. Clements, *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), esp. 12–16; similarly celebrative narratives appear, at least occasionally, in such works as Ernst-Joachim Waschke, ed., *Hermann Gunkel (1862–1932)* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 141; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013); Ute E. Eisen and Erhard S. Gerstenberger, ed., *Hermann Gunkel revisited. Literatur- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Exegese in unserer Zeit 20; Berlin: LIT, 2010); Douglas A. Knight, *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel*, 3rd ed. (Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), esp. 58–59.

summarized his corpus and synopsized his methods – most of all as concerns the Hebrew Bible – ofttimes with careful attention to and detailed description of their genesis and growth. Given such accounts – available and plentiful alike – and the focus of this book upon historiography, the chapter at hand spends less time reporting on the contents of his labors or recounting the results that he delivered than scrutinizing the occupations and operations themselves as Gunkel wrote about antiquity. It begins with a little-known incident: how he was effectively forced to leave the field of New Testament scholarship and turn, instead, to the Old. The chapter then considers, in detail, Gunkel's labors leading up to that transition, when he devoted himself to the history of Christianity and Judaism. Through a rather extensive analysis, it advances a more subtle argument: what distinguished him in the end was already there at the start. The essential components of Gunkel's interpretive program – reassembled as a coordinated whole in the chapter still to follow – proceeded not from his empirical material itself but from his broader understandings of the past, whether textual, human, or religious. This exploration therefore demonstrates an epistemological continuity not only throughout the oeuvre of Gunkel but also across a generational divide amidst the crisis of historicism.

5.1 New Testament by Desire, Old Testament by Demand

Gunkel was, at heart, a biblical theologian. A deceptively mundane statement, this sentence actually encapsulates all his entire intellectual undertakings. Gunkel may have hoped to incorporate unconventional texts along with innovative methods – from literary studies through comparative religion to cultural parallels and the like – but he trained his focus all the while upon the Christian Bible, its abiding import for a troubled modern age always on the horizon. He, like most of his Göttingen cohort, dropped heavy anchor in New Testament research. Yet more than merely prologue, Gunkel's earliest convictions revealed much already latent that would later come to define him only over time.

In an important episode well-known to his biographers but less so to almost anyone else, Gunkel's academic train was derailed, for a time, in Göttingen.[3] In October of 1887, Gunkel sought permission to pursue a licentiate and the then-attendant habilitation, through the Faculty of Theology, in the field of biblical studies, for which he submitted a 34-page treatise grounded in the New Testament canon, titled "The Effects of the Holy Spirit According to Popular Conception of the Apostolic Period and According to the Teaching of the Apostle

[3] See Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, esp. 30–40; cf. also Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 15–17; Konrad von Rabenau, "Hermann Gunkel auf rauhen Pfaden nach Halle," *Evangelische Theologie* 30 (1970): 433–44; Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol. 4, *From the Enlightenment to the Twentieth Century*, 338–39.

Paul. Part 1."[4] June of 1888 saw his oral examination, or colloquium, before all the Göttingen professors of theology, who graded the trial *magna cum laude*. Scheduled for July but postponed until October, Gunkel's public disputation then centered on the theses he submitted and debated, with eventual New Testament expert Johannes Weiß (1863–1914) and church historian Carl Mirbt (1860–1929). Notably, ten of the twelve propositions concerned the Bible, and seven of those ten focused squarely on the New Testament – and thus only three on the Old.[5] This dissertation, examination, and disputation earned Gunkel his licentiate. For his habilitation qualification, undertaken the following day, he delivered a lecture on the "Eschatology of Jewish Apocalypses." In fitting with convention, the Faculty requested the requisite *venia legendi* for "biblical theology and exegesis." Thereupon the Ministry of Culture representative at the University, Ernst von Meier (1832–1911), conferred on Gunkel a biennial permission to teach, i. e., from October of 1888 to that of 1890.[6] He was therefore on his way to becoming a fully qualified biblical scholar – and one not confined to the Old Testament.

An unfunny thing had happened on the way to the forum, however. In the same window in time, between Octobers of 1887 and 1888, Karl Gunkel had adjured the Prussian Ministry to grant a scholarship to Hermann, maintaining he himself had not the resources to support both sons at once, Hermann as docent and Karl (Jr.) in legal studies. Accordingly, the Ministry wrote von Meier, in November of 1887, and solicited assessments from the Faculty of Theology as well as from de Lagarde, in the Faculty of Philosophy. This evaluation, delivered in April, 1888, found of Gunkel "that his academic talent, with all due recognition of his ambition, [is] no excellent one, his personality, with all due recognition of his character traits, is no sympathetic one, and that his habilitation is hence undesired."[7] Nevertheless, the report recommended he complete the licentiate process and seek a position in the church, rather than pursue a career in academia. Already in November of 1887, de Lagarde had sent word to the concerned director at the Ministry, Althoff at that time, and stated Gunkel would almost surely succeed in his licentiate, but de Lagarde advised against his pursuit of the

[4] Hermann Gunkel, "Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus. Erster Teil." Expanded and published the same year, the work appeared under the slightly-altered title *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus. Eine biblisch-theologische Studie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888), though the second printing of 1899 dropped the second *nach* – and added a preface and index as well [ET: *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*]. Given its occasional imprecision, the translation requires cautious use.

[5] For a translation of the theses, see p. 214 n. 17 below. On the grade assigned, see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 34 n. 90.

[6] However, von Meier had assumed the post only in 1888 and resigned in 1894 on account of Althoff's politics and person.

[7] Report of von Meier to the Ministry of Culture, April 26, 1888, in Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 32; Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 17.

habilitation, at least in Göttingen – a maneuver meant to favor Rahlfs, whom he preferred. The extent of this treachery by de Lagarde was all the more evident in the very impetus, for Gunkel had solicited his support for the application as an expert assessor on the matter.[8] Despite this actual opposition by a supposed supporter of his, Gunkel triumphed twice, albeit fleetingly. He obtained not only permission to teach but also his scholarship, to begin April 1, 1889, to last two years at first and to be renewed pending adequate research and teaching. In fall semester of 1888–89, Gunkel taught two courses corresponding to his *venia*, in "biblical theology and exegesis." But this first semester would also be his last.

As a sequel to the story, Gunkel went to Halle. In January, 1889, Althoff, still promoting Gunkel, encouraged Halle's Faculty of Theology to consider him a potential successor to Friedrich Baethgen (1849–1905) – as associate professor of Old Testament – since the latter was slated for a full position in Greifswald, after only a year in *Hala Saxonum*.[9] Notwithstanding the positive appraisal by Old Testament *ordinarius* Emil Kautzsch (1841–1910), Halle decided against the younger *Göttinger*. Yet Althoff stayed the course. During the month of March, he proposed to Gunkel, in private, the possibility of habilitation as a private docent in Halle – "counsel that was a command," as Hans Schmidt (1877–1953) later recounted.[10] The following month, Gunkel received a renewable stipend from the Ministry of Culture. Opposing less the person of Gunkel and more the process of Althoff, the Faculty in Halle protested, contending such procedures must proceed pursuant to its own prescriptions, which demanded a second published treatise from the candidate within the field of Old Testament. Although the Ministry ultimately freed him from the requirement for publication of a second disquisition, it did not exempt him from the obligation to deliver an inaugural lecture, despite his own petition to avoid it. In May, Gunkel delivered the lecture, entitled "The Eschatological Hope of Judaism in its Connection to Old and New Testament Expectations" – a presentation that won him few friends in the Faculty.[11] However, his own hopes and expectations would have to change in Halle.

At this stage in his long, hard run to an academic career, Gunkel gradually transitioned to Old Testament research. Much of the coaching came from Kautzsch, with the course set by his teaching obligations. In 1889, the publisher Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, who had printed his licentiate treatise the previous year, suggested to Gunkel that he compose a commentary on the book of Genesis for its series "Handkommentar zum Alten Testament" – albeit against the

[8] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 33 n. 89; cf. also 34 n. 92. Hammann suggests that von Meier may have mostly followed de Lagarde's appraisal; Ritschl may have shown similar skepticism (cf. ibid., 35).

[9] Hammann mistakenly misprints the year as 1888 (ibid., 50).

[10] Hans Schmidt, "In Memoriam Hermann Gunkel," *Theologische Blätter* 11 (1932): 97–103, at 98.

[11] The German title read "Die eschatologische Hoffnung des Judentums in ihrem Verhältnis zu alt- und neutestamentlichen Erwartungen": see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 52–53.

initial opposition of its editor, the Strasbourg Old Testament *ordinarius* Wilhelm Nowack (1850–1928).[12] Gunkel promptly rejected the idea. A triennium later, however, in 1892, he accepted. (Since two other projects of his took precedence, the volume did not appear until 1901). Though adumbrated by his final year of studies and by his lectures for habilitation (Göttingen, 1888) and for inauguration (Halle, 1889), the subject of Jewish apocalyptic thought developed even further, beginning in 1891, through his own discussions with Harnack and through the reviews arranged for him to write in the latter's *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.[13] So, too, Kautzsch commissioned Gunkel, in 1893, for a commentary on and translation of the pseudepigraphic "4 Esdras" (better known in English as part of 2 Esdras but also called the Jewish Apocalypse of Ezra), to feature in his own *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. (This tome hit the market only at the end of the century, however.[14]) In 1894, Gunkel published his now legendary volume *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12*.[15] This inquiry spanned the entire range of his research on the Bible, from Babylonian through Israelite to Jewish texts and on to early Christian ones.

An Old Testament *extraordinarius* for only a year at Halle, Gunkel then went to Berlin at the start of the following term, 1895–1896, to hold a comparable position – after a short stay in a psychiatric hospital, that is.[16] Beginning there in the Prussian capital, Gunkel's center of gravity would remain for the rest of his career in research on the Hebrew Bible. The questions he had asked, the ways he had sought to answer them, and the conclusions he had drawn over the previous decade, through his inquiries into early Judaism and formative Christianity, continued to direct his reconstructions of the past as he ventured further back into antiquity, whether that past be Egyptian, Babylonian, or Israelite. Indeed, the hallmarks of his work on the Old Testament in particular and on religion in general – the genealogy of Christianity to Israel, the study of non-canonical sources, the focus on diffusion, the stress upon orality, the analysis of form, and the accent

[12] Cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 51; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 113–114; cf. Wilhelm Ruprecht, *Väter und Söhne. Zwei Jahrhunderte Buchhändler in einer deutschen Universitätsstadt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935), 211, though Nowack's first choice goes unmentioned.

[13] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 105–13; Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 36–40.

[14] Hermann Gunkel, "Das vierte Buch Esra," in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, ed. Emil Kautzsch, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898–1900), 2:331–401; for the editions, see Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 37 n. 9; Hammann, 53, 105.

[15] Hermann Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12, mit Beiträgen von Heinrich Zimmern* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895). Dated to 1895, the work began to appear already in 1894, a common practice only emphasized here to stress its association with Gunkel's time in Halle, rather than that in Berlin. In view of the English translation's inconsistent quality, the following discussion follows the German; cf. pp. 242 n. 166, 247 n. 194.

[16] For Gunkel's stay, see Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 81, cf. 84.

on inspired persons – had already become manifest before he occupied a full professorship, devoted himself to the subject, or even finished his academic qualification. The ultimate ends and means of Gunkel's scholarship hence persisted regardless of the data he examined. This historian of antiquity may have studied the New Testament by desire, the Old Testament by demand, but still grander interests and ideas motivated his attempts at gaining entry to the ancient world.

5.2 The Finish at the Start

The earliest efforts by Gunkel, in Christianity and Judaism, exhibited an intellectual architecture that would manifest itself in the course of his career – and eventually come to characterize his labors in the history of Israel. Instead of centering on predecessors in his research on the Hebrew Bible, this section seeks to trace the roots of his work on the Old Testament back into that on Jewish and Christian literature. Indeed, the same epistemological mechanics were operative even before his move to Berlin geographically or to the Old Testament professionally, no matter how much he continued to adjust and to refine them throughout his life. Save for the two biographies written on him, many of these early writings by him – most of all the book reviews he wrote – tend to fall outside the purview of interpreters when they examine his attempts to understand antiquity. However, sustained scrutiny of his texts required for qualifications earned in Göttingen, of his investigations into 2 Esdras, and of his landmark *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* demonstrates fundamental elements of Gunkel's intellectual inquiries already firmly in place even prior to the decided shift towards the Old Testament. As expressed in the previous chapter, the foundational assumptions and the incipient methodological procedures were not specific to his data but rather converged with the changing currents of intellectual life across the human sciences at the *fin de siècle*. The same objectives, the same methods, and the same priorities emerged when Gunkel was still a would-be New Testament scholar. In retrospect, the pursuits essayed by Gunkel – from their final destination to their specific paths – suggest how methods follow theory, at times even irrespective of data.

5.2.1 Binding Ancient Israel to Christianity

The basic structure underlying Gunkel's thought first appeared in work submitted at university. One of its major components concerned the ancient sources to consider from the start. Submitted and defended as part of the requirements for his licentiate degree, the theses submitted by Gunkel included one statement in particular whose logical conclusion he would continue to extend and which would come to characterize his work. The fourth proposition made a simple

declaration: "Introduction to the N[ew] T[estament] (*Einleitung ins N. T.*) is the science of the sources of the apostolic era."[17] With such a proclamation, Gunkel gainsaid a rather long tradition of New Testament research, one almost exclusively devoted to the canonical texts, which further stressed the history of their composition as well as their distinctive nature. Accordingly, Gunkel pronounced contemporaneous, non-canonical (though presumbly still Christian) materials not only important for but even integral to studying the past. But he was not alone in this conviction.

By no mere stroke of happenstance, a strikingly similar declaration had, in fact, appeared in Halle already two years prior. It came from the pen of Eichhorn, an acclaimed if likely overvalued figure in the common narrative told both by and about the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* of Göttingen.[18] In his own licentiate theses, Eichhorn had maintained, "Introduction to the New Testament must be the literary history of earliest Christianity (*urchristliche Literaturgeschichte*)."[19] As imprecise as "primitive" or "earliest" may be within this context and as underdeveloped as the potential consequence of this postulation for the study of early Christianity may appear, a more expansive set of sources for understanding the ancient past seems likely to lie on the horizon.[20] If the theolosopher Troeltsch would later argue Wrede – the eventual questor for the historical Jesus – had brokered Eichhorn's influence on that circle of young scholars in Göttingen, his influence on Gunkel was undoubtedly more direct. Indeed, in company with Weiß (who defended his own theses against Gunkel and who also served as the opponent for those of Gunkel in debate for licentiate proceedings) and in contact with Eichhorn himself, Gunkel belonged to a slightly older, if less self-conscious,

---

[17] Klatt has published the original theses (*Hermann Gunkel*, 16 n. 3), translated here:
1. No psalm from David
2. Joel is post-exilic
3. A true history underlies Hosea 1–3
4. Introduction to the N[ew] T[estament] is the science of the sources of the apostolic era
5. "Matt 29:19 is no dominical saying" (Harnack)
6. The Synoptic and the Johannine portrait of John the Baptist contradict one another
7. Ἐλισαβετ (Luke 1:2) is a scribal error
8. The doctrine of predestination has its most pronounced form in Paul
9. The Epistle of James is post-Pauline
10. The difference between Paul and James in the doctrine of justification must be understood from their doctrine of law
11. Baptism in extremis is a Catholic institution
12. The CF's [i. e., Formula of Concord's] doctrine of predestination must be understood from the authors' intention to give practical instruction for the Christian homily. This intention is to be understood as thoroughly achieved.

[18] On the frequently myopic emphasis on Eichhorn's influence, especially in Greßmann's telling, cf. Graf, "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät,'" 242, 247 n. 42, 279–80; cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 22–24.

[19] Greßmann, *Albert Eichhorn und Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, 8.

[20] Cf. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 28, 36–37.

class within the so-called History of Religion(s) School in Göttingen. This section of the school proved much less overt in its intellectual departure from Ritschl than the ranks of those who followed.[21]

Stating he went to Halle "still a Wellhausian on the whole," a retrospective Gunkel voiced his gratitude to Eichhorn for having aided in his break from Wellhausen and Ritschl.[22] Even before Gunkel submitted his theses, in 1888, Eichhorn had tendered his own, earned his degree, and, having habilitated, served as private docent in the field of church history, all at the University of Halle.[23] He secured an associate post the fall of that same year, in 1888. Though Gunkel would join him later – once he transferred for his own rehabilitation – the two had also been acquainted in Göttingen. There, Eichhorn had studied before and returned during Gunkel's time at the Georgia Augusta. From spring of 1884 till fall of 1885, as Eichhorn was preparing the requirements of his Hallensian degree, both men alongside Wrede attended lectures by the newly installed Wilamowitz on the history of Greek literature. The three found further exchange in the "Academic-Theological Association."[24] Now, no extant attestation indicates a direct dependence – literarily – of Gunkel's fourth thesis statement upon the third of Eichhorn's. Yet a clear conceptual affinity together with the circumstantialities of a chronological priority, shared geographical locations, and almost certain interchange between the two do suggest Gunkel would have probably known in the very least the content of Eichhorn's theses as he developed them in Göttingen. In fact, Wrede, too, averred, in his own set of postulates, from 1891, "A lexicon for the N[ew] T[estament] only suffices the needs of science when it encompasses, retrogressively, the literature of late Judaism and, progressively, the apostolic fathers."[25] Indeed, the circle of students comprising this putative "school" frequently submitted and defended similar theses for their own licentiate degrees, which betrayed no little cohesion among them.[26] Apart from his *plaidoyer* for a wider set of data in the study of Christian origins, the larger body of work that Gunkel tendered in his academic training demonstrated additional features that would become characteristic of his later work on ancient Israel.

---

[21] For exploration of such subdivisions, see Graf, "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät,'" 241–42, 279–83; cf.pp. 184–86 above.

[22] Klatt, "Ein Brief von Hermann Gunkel über Albert Eichhorn an Hugo Greßmann," 5; cf. Greßmann, *Albert Eichhorn und Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, 5; for a more nuanced appraisal by Gunkel, cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 52–53.

[23] Lüdemann and Schröder, ed., *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen*, 63, 66; Friedrich Volbehr and Richard Weyl, *Professoren und Dozenten der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, 1665–1915* (Kiel: Schmidt & Klaunig, 1916), 17–18; Greßmann, *Albert Eichhorn und Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, 5–7.

[24] Lüdemann and Schröder, ed., *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen*, 33, 35; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 23, 25–27.

[25] Renz, "Thesen zur Erlangung der theologischen Lizentiatenwürde an der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen 1888–1893," 301.

[26] See Graf, "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät.'"

Above and beyond his theses, the thesis he wrote exhibited a conceptual machinery already well at work. Gunkel expanded the treatise submitted for his degree, which he published that same year, in 1888, and titled *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus. Eine biblisch-theologische Studie*. Rather than some early, unindicative text marked less by intellectual ambition than the pursuit of a degree, this work displayed a real sense of purpose in its pages, the desire for a different kind of inquiry into the past. Furthermore, in hindsight it proves consistent with his subsequent endeavors. With this monograph on Paul in the apostolic era, Gunkel gave high prominence to a study of the past with concern to contexts wider and deeper alike, to individual experience, and to distinctive personalities.

Gunkel's historical interest first centered on derivation. With little hesitation, and with reference to his subtitle, this young historian of ancient theology proclaimed, "The task of biblical theology is to reach a decision, in each and every case, concerning the ancestry (*Herkunft*) of a New Testament idea …. "[27] More pointedly, he pronounced, "It is a grave error in method, which must result in a mass of misconceptions, to attempt to derive Paul's sphere of ideas or even his usage directly from the Old Testament and consequently to ignore the apostle's origin in Judaism."[28] Such a premise warranted an open data set. The study of ancient Christianity, in this view, demanded a wider and longer inquiry than the immediate texts and contexts of the New Testament or even the Bible more broadly. When Gunkel declared Judaism the "true womb of the gospel" (*den eigentlichen Mutterschoss des Evangeliums*), he therefore severed Testaments Old and New.[29] In consequence, he created more space for other pasts than those recorded in the canon, between the covers of the Christian Bible. Gunkel thus examined an earlier apocryphal literature even as he explored later Christian writings dated all the way to the second century, yielding a total span of several centuries for an investigation into the apostolic period.[30] In a sense, Gunkel wanted to lay down his microscope and to study the past with binoculars, to go beyond what lay before him. Alongside this diachronic dimension, with its stress on lines of descent, Gunkel's inquiry into the past encompassed a synchronic study as well, an assessment of the wider context around the text at hand.[31] As an illustration, on the monograph's very first page, the author plainly stated,

---

[27] Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, 1st ed., 4 [cf. ET: *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 13, which translates, "the origin of a New Testament idea"].

[28] Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 76.

[29] Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, 4 [cf. ET: *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 13, which reads, "the real matrix of the gospel"].

[30] Gunkel mentions Ignatius and the Didache: idem, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 38–39; cf. the passage index as well, which first appeared in the German's second edition, of 1899.

[31] So also Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 31.

"For it cannot be disputed that even Paul's position at this point in his teaching can be properly understood and evaluated only when we first consider the ideas available to the apostle within Christian circles."[32] The title said it all: "according to the popular conception of the apostolic era and according to the teaching of the apostle Paul." The thrust of the volume studied an individual amidst his contemporaries. In doing so, Gunkel hoped to demonstrate the distinction of Paul within his epoch. Already here in his earliest opus emerged an accent on extended timelines, on the one hand, and a broader context, on the other. As he insisted later, in a programmatic essay, "Our cardinal conviction of history is that we are not in the position to understand a person, a time, a concept apart from their prehistory but that we can only speak of a true, living understanding once we know the history of their formation. Historical insight is insight from the historical context."[33] As Gunkel continued to sharpen his eye and find his voice, he would only magnify his insistence on this multidimensional perspective.

In addition to the mode for exploration of the past, a principal objective for such study was clear already here as well. In the end, Gunkel sought experience. The investigation of contextual and genealogical histories – that is, synchronic and diachronic analyses – sought a fuller comprehension of the world behind ideas and their transmission in texts. Encompassing two separate yet interrelated aspects, the evaluation of experience involved the sensations and perceptions of the experiencer, on the one hand, and the apprehension of that experiencer by the surrounding community, on the other. This line of inquiry led Gunkel, further, beyond cognitive understanding or even emotion to the sensual and the irrational. One phenomenon in particular occupied his interest and provided the basis for his volume: encounters with "the spirit." Gunkel strove to contrast "the dogmatic concept of 'Spirit'" with "a livelier picture of the πνεῦμα," a distinction he hoped to draw through meticulous analysis of which precise phenomena the earliest of Christians had deemed to be pneumatic and how such occurrences then connected to the spirit. Through this twofold study, the historian of early Christianity hoped "to define the concept of an activity of the Spirit and thus that of the Spirit himself," which should "show the relation between the Spirit and similar concepts."[34] When Gunkel penned the preface to the second edition of his volume, he later summarized, "The real task of my little work was to ascertain the symptoms by which an 'effect' of the Spirit was recognized …. It was thus my concern not to describe individual pneumatic phenomena but to set forth what

[32] Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 9 [i. e., GO: *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, 1].

[33] Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 10–11 [cf. ET: "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament," 404, which renders the passage with a slightly different nuance].

[34] Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 9.

was common to them all and thus the typically pneumatic."[35] Assuming this statement actually did reproduce his intentions of ten years prior, when he had written the treatise, the author was beginning to employ typology for the classification of phenomena, to undertake comparison for the determination of distinctiveness, and to venture historicization of theological ideas. For this reason, Klatt concludes of Gunkel's thinking, "Dogma, teaching, definition is secondary, experience is primary."[36] If the search for lived experience of old, as opposed to doctrine or instruction, launched his exploration into the spirit of ancient Christianity, an *a priori* object – what that spirit was, where to find it, and how to understand it – had helped him organize his investigation from the very start.

Although Gunkel devoted himself to an historical study of the spirit, he did not fully free himself from systematics. *Prima facie*, he did diverge from more dogmatic ventures insofar as his exploration yielded greater sensitivity to context and diversity in similar yet separable phenomena. Such an historicizing venture disrupted any one-to-one equivalence of conceptions past and present, of ancient and modern ideas.[37] Good historian that he was, Gunkel also discerned between an initial occurrence of the past and its subsequent reception, both by contemporaries and in transmission.[38] *Secunda facie*, however, he still traced a single idea (*scilicet*, "the spirit") and deployed this ostensibly non-etic, non-typological category to encompass variable phenomena on the assumption of some ontological affinity. "[I]n the matter of the Spirit's activities," the author wrote at the very outset, "we have to do with an ancient Hebrew or perhaps primitive Semitic conception that had undergone only slight changes in the apostolic age"; he continued further, "[t]his primitive Christian view of the Spirit was also held in the post-apostolic period, and it persisted in many circles far into the second century."[39] This sequence argued, then, for an idea first rooted either genetically in the Hebrew or the Semitic, chronologically in the ancient, or anthropologically in the primitive that then served as the stem for thinking in early Christian

[35] Ibid., 2, cf. 91 n. 29. He continued, "I had also realized that the task first of all is not to produce a New Testament doctrine of the Spirit but rather to describe the specific experience of the pneumatic" (ibid.).

[36] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 31; cf. also Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 75 n. 1. Gunkel offered a similar appraisal of Paul: "to Paul's mind the practical question was primary and the theory throwing light on it was secondary" (idem, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 86).

[37] In fact, the second printing's prologue included direct opposition to "the modernizings of exegetes who, without historical reflection and influenced by rationalism, know nothing of the 'effects' of the πνεῦμα and render 'Spirit' a pure abstraction" (idem, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 2).

[38] Ibid., 22, cf. 26; see also his introduction to the second edition, 3, 5, 8.

[39] Ibid., 13, 38, cf. also, e. g., 44, 59, 64, 92. He later qualified, however, "something related to Old Testament ideas appears in pre-Christian, Hellenistic Judaism, whether or not it is to be traced to ethnic influence. And here again it is clear that this view of the Spirit could also be understood by the Hellenes of that period" (ibid., 48, cf. also 31, 44). For Gunkel, the distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaisms proved essential: cf., e. g., ibid., 76, 63, 123–24; see also p. 220 below.

thought. If Gunkel relied on language to link the spirit and glossolalia (*pneuma* in the New Testament, *hitnabbē'* in the Old, and *mantis* in Chrysostom), he employed the "symptoms" of glossolalia to connect the spirit with prophecy, revelation, and ecstasy.[40] "But we are clearly in the right when we use just this gift [sc., glossolalia] to establish the symptoms of the Spirit's activity," he maintained, "since it must have been widely regarded as the spiritual gift par excellence."[41] To arrive at this conclusion, Gunkel availed himself of a transitive logic: A equaled B, so any overlap between B and C suggested that C evinced A as well. Any number of "workings" could thus correspond to his rather simple definition of spirit: "the supernatural power of God which works miracles in and through the person."[42] To couple events of the past with a transcendent spirit, Gunkel thus used different ties. At base, this historian of the early Christian community seemed keen to make the past not an all too foreign country.

Gunkel supplied, in consequence, the history of an idea – and a rather Christian one to boot. Though without using a strict language of morphology, that is, of a proteus apparent in manifold forms, Gunkel still tried to trace the transmutation of a concept, which he defined through its effects. His search for symptoms in the apostolic age both represented and wrote small a cardinal belief that he would underline throughout his whole career: multiple and multifarious manifestations of a single essence. Even more apparent in his later labors – which expanded the periods, the peoples, and the places under review – these absolutized, almost neoplatonic forms manifested themselves throughout space and time, without respecting the tidier demarcations of disciplinary turfs. Akin to the Lovejoyan "unit-theme" or Hegelian "philosopheme," such analysis of the spirit produced an ideal type – a hypostatized entity Quentin Skinner has, in another context, described as a "reification of doctrines," with doctrine here representing not a dogmatic tenet of the theological variety but rather an essentialized concept.[43] Gunkel stopped short, in the end, of fully historicizing or contextualizing his object of inquiry, creating instead an ahistorical subject that transcended time and place, language and culture. Further, he may well have launched a clear empirical project to recover conceptions of the spirit circulating in the Christian community, but in the end he confirmed an understanding of the spirit standard in traditional theology: his study of the apostolic age upheld the apostolic view as canonized in the biblical texts. Nevertheless, Gunkel did so even as he sought to

[40] Ibid., 30–38.

[41] Ibid., 31.

[42] Ibid., 35, cf. 58–59, 64, 79.

[43] Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53, at 11; cf. also, e. g., Donald R. Kelley, "What is Happening to the History of Ideas?," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51, no. 1 (1990): 3–25; idem, "Horizons of Intellectual History: Retrospect, Circumspect, Prospect," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48, no. 1 (1987): 143–69. See Gunkel's later reflections, however, in his introduction to the second edition: idem, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 4–5.

differentiate his own examination of that very concept from those of systematic studies in the domain of Christian theology.

Alongside his conscious attempt at historicizing ancient Christian thought, Gunkel also hoped to defamiliarize that understanding of spirit by stressing its perceived ecstatic qualities. This endeavor explicitly contrasted the more rationalist interpretations of theologians and biblical scholars, who had aimed to tame the ancient world just as the classicists had tried to modernize the Greeks of classical antiquity.[44] Crucially, the allure of experience spirited Gunkel to a most specific sort: encounters of the sensual and irrational kind. "[I]n a naiveté not yet troubled by reflection," when fancy could still run free, and "[un]able to conceive the Spirit in total abstraction as a power without a material substrate," the ancient Israelites, so Gunkel, saw the spirit as material in nature.[45] He believed this understanding corresponded to their capacity: this people of the ancient world simply had no faculty for higher levels of abstraction. Like the Israelites, so the Jews thought in terms of substance. Since the earliest Christians had come from the Jewish community, Gunkel believed such a conception of spirit had entered Christianity at the start.[46] Accordingly, he argued the Pentecost narrative betrayed "a quite naive and sensuous view of the Spirit."[47] In the early Christian era, the spirit "was more than a concept, an abstraction," for "[o]nly where the Spirit is nothing more than the object of a dogmatic or religious-philosophical theory … does the vivid notion yield to the abstract concept."[48] Gunkel attributed the gradual abstraction of the spirit to the impact of the Greeks, whose higher philosophy did much to change Christian theology. Only "Hellenic culture" would create the possibility for an immaterial understanding of the spirit.[49] In fact, Gunkel divided East and West as well as past and present when he drew contrasts between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaisms, on the one hand, and between ancient and modern thought, on the other. Describing the apostle as an ancient Jew, Gunkel stressed, "Paul was no child of the Enlightenment.[50] For this historian of New Testament ideas, the spirit's principal property was its supernaturality.[51] The ancient world was expressly not that of modern Germany.

Gunkel even indulged in the irrationality of the spirit, eschewing its association with the kind of consciousness, purposiveness, and ethics ("moralo-religiosity") so standard for theological discourse on the topic. In his account of the

---

[44] Cf. Gunkel's critique of Wendt on the distinction between "spirit" and "power" (idem, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 92).

[45] Ibid., 61. Gunkel still stressed the supernaturality as the most important quality, however (ibid., 64).

[46] Ibid., 63–64, cf. also 47–48.

[47] Ibid., 64.

[48] Ibid., 66, 61.

[49] Ibid., 63, cf. 45–48, 101.

[50] Ibid., 125, see further esp. 59–66, cf. also 14, 29, 35, 92 n. 31, 115 n. 82.

[51] See esp. ibid., 64.

past, the alleged insufficiency or even inconsistency in "rational reflection" on the nature of the spirit within the early Christian era should occasion little surprise to modern interpreters, for "a person did not so much reflect upon as live in the Spirit."[52] Instead of conscious meditation, he contended,

> the apostolic age recognizes certain phenomena that manifest a power which "fills" a person, that is, which so completely possesses a person that he often becomes its all but unwilling instrument. They are occurrences that seem to defy every explanation by natural powers inherent in man; and precisely because they cannot be derived from the world or from human nature, they are regarded as being of divine origin, as activities of the Spirit.[53]

The spirit therefore grasped the human, not the other way around. Being "enigmatic and mighty," its effects gave rise to "fear mixed with astonishment and hence horror."[54] As he conceived the early Christian community, these encounters with the spirit were less reverie than revelry.[55] Even more, the spirit helped explain the inexplicable. Representing, in Gunkel's estimation, a matter of "cause and effect" instead of "means and ends," "[b]elief in the Spirit is not for the purpose of grasping God's plan for the world but for the purpose of explaining the presence of certain, above all inexplicable, phenomena by means of the transcendent."[56] Further still, these supernatural occurrences had no discernible purpose: "the consciousness of a special divine purpose did not belong to the symptoms of an activity of the Spirit," Gunkel simply stated.[57] Nor did the spirit have much to do with morality. Continuing to defamiliarize the understanding of the spirit in antiquity, he asserted, "how little of piety and morality must have inhered in the pervasive manifestations of the Spirit," and, again, "Righteous conduct has nothing to do with the Spirit."[58] As Gunkel imagined ancient Israel and early Judaism, they did have a moral dimension, but this quality did not come from the spirit, at least primarily.[59] He thus deprived the spirit of ethics and doctrine alike.[60]

With such an indecorous addition (or restoration) of the sensual, supernatural, and irrational to the conception of the spirit in formative Christianity, Gunkel brazenly defied a powerful trend in liberal theology to deterge the biblical texts and to cleanse the Christian past. Such qualities had seemed rather disreputable

---

[52] Ibid., 34–35.

[53] Ibid., 32; cf. also 31, 33–34, 93–94. Following Weizsäcker, however, Gunkel differentiated the pneumatic from the ecstatic: whereas the spirit operated unintelligibly to consciousness in the first, in the second the spirit penetrated consciousness completely (ibid., 35 n. 40, cf. 93–94).

[54] Ibid., 39, cf. 89. Gunkel contended not only the production but also the interpretation of scripture constituted a mysterious, pneumatic affair (cf. esp. ibid., 37).

[55] Accordingly, in Corinth "such wild confusion prevailed in the gatherings that Paul had to emphasize the need for proper order" (ibid., 86).

[56] Ibid., 32–33, see 31–35 more broadly, cf. also 23.

[57] Ibid., 25–26, see 21–30 more generally, cf. also 22, 29, 86, 87.

[58] Ibid., 19, 21, cf. 99.

[59] See ibid., 16–21, cf. also 50, 97–98, 102, 108.

[60] Cf. also ibid., 13–15.

for a modern bourgeois faith.[61] To state "the concept of the Spirit originally has nothing to do with that of the community," to cast the kingdom of God as "an act of God's supernatural power," and to find in holy scripture "absolutely no doctrinal statements regarding the Spirit" was to contravene an entire generation of theologians devoted to sanitizing and modernizing select moments of antiquity, just as the ancient Greeks had been made in a modern German image.[62] With an emphasis on ecstasy and the unstaid practices of old, figures like Gunkel and Duhm did much to make the prophets less familiar and more mystifying.[63]

Together with a deeper historicization and a focus on experience both direct and second-hand, Gunkel's treatise on the spirit showed another fascination: inspired personalities. First, he affirmed a correspondence between the understanding shared by the community and that upheld by the apostle. The author argued "that Paul had a most vivid view of the πνεῦμα, which he daily felt at work within him, that he assigned to the Spirit the same activities as did the communities near him, and that he thus perceived the Spirit by the same symptoms and evaluated them just as they did."[64] The ideas they held in common included belief in a supernatural (divine) power and in the (human) heart as the locus of that power's work. However, once Gunkel had described a collective understanding, he could then cast the apostle's thought in stark relief against this background. Gunkel even organized the volume so as to heighten the originality of Paul. Although the English translation has constructed "Related Concepts" as a third and separate section of the work, the German original had only fashioned two (i. e., "The Popular Views" and "The Teaching of Paul"), with the third part being a nondescript appendix.[65] The structure underlined his argument. This arrangement drew attention by its form to what was common among the early Christians and what was peculiar to Paul.

The modern theologian ascribed to this ancient one a distinctive understanding of the spirit. The apostle's particular genius, so Gunkel, emerged, firstly, in his ethical conception of spiritual gifts and, secondly, in his somewhat democratized view of the Christian life. Not only did Paul consider the spirit proof of the truth of the gospel – a conviction ostensibly shared among the early Christians – but he also tied it to eschatology. "It is only Paul," wrote Gunkel, "who infers from a present possession of the Spirit that the Spirit will bring about eternal life."[66] First, the historian described a spiritual lion the apostle had to tame as well. Given the

[61] Cf., e. g., ibid., 92 n. 31.

[62] Ibid., 41, 72, 14, cf. 81–85, see also 113–14.

[63] For a brief overview of this commonality between the two – with the usual interest in possible dependence – see Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 34–35, 206–08; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 242–43.

[64] Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 79, cf. also 81, 88, 91, 95–96, 116 n. 84.

[65] Cf. the tables of contents for idem, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit,* and idem, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*.

[66] Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 83–84.

outbreak of spiritual gifts within the community, "such wild confusion prevailed in the gatherings that Paul had to emphasize the need for proper order."[67] This disorder in worship corresponded to still another confusion: namely, a lack of order in values.[68] As Gunkel set the scene, the unrestrained Christians of Corinth disputed the relative worth of spiritual gifts since "the community lacked consciousness of the purpose, and therefore a proper criterion for evaluating the charismata."[69] To bring order to this chaos, Paul proposed that the wellbeing of the community itself should serve as the measure for evaluating the relative virtues of those gifts as well as the proper time and place for them; furthermore, he proclaimed edification of the community as the true intent behind these endowments of the spirit and therefore, on account of that divine will, attached an ethical framework to their use.[70] Gunkel concluded in the end, "It was Paul's service, alongside his lofty and inspiring view of the 'community as the body of Christ,' to have furnished a solid criterion by which gifts of the Spirit could be judged and evaluated from that moment on."[71] If such an intellectual departure raised "him to a dizzying height above common opinion, this is even more the case at still another point."[72] For Gunkel, the greatness of Paul continued.

Secondly, the apostle expanded the scope of the spirit to include the Christian life itself. Paul not only evaluated the spiritual endowments in question but also reckoned more among those gifts. According to Gunkel, the apostle saw the spirit at work in a range of ("Christian") functions otherwise deemed quite normal or natural – that is, unsupernatural.[73] In fact, Paul considered the Christian life in its entirety to be contingent on the spirit, an expansive perception of the divine that Gunkel judged "a totally different, infinitely higher evaluation of Christian conduct."[74] While the apostle regarded Christian existence in and of itself – and thus the Christian – as pneumatic in its nature, the historian regarded this transference as "one of Paul's most ingenious and truly pneumatic conceptions."[75] Rather than operate upon the individual from

[67] Ibid., 86.
[68] Ibid., 85
[69] Ibid., 86.
[70] Ibid., esp. 87, 89.
[71] Ibid., 90, cf. also 112.
[72] Ibid., 91.
[73] Ibid., cf. also 108, 110, 111. Shortly afterwards, he summarized, "Spirit is the divine, supernatural power, and when Paul asserts that the entire conduct of the Christian is an activity of God's Spirit, he is saying that there is a power manifest in the Christian life which is divine, that is, absolutely supernatural, and which can never be explained by human powers or by this aeon" (ibid., 93).
[74] Ibid., 96. Juxtaposing the two, Gunkel wrote, "The community thus regards pneumatic what is extraordinary in Christian existence, but Paul what is usual; the community what is individual and unique, but Paul what is common to all; the community what is isolated in Christian existence, but Paul the Christian life as such" (ibid.).
[75] Ibid.

without, this divine, supernatural power actually possessed the individual on the inside, "taking hold of the person himself and altering his entire way of life."[76] Gunkel's description of Paul's description bordered on the violent: "The power that rules the Christian is absolutely superhuman; it is originally foreign to the ego and thus not at all a universal capacity, and it rules over him so absolutely that it does not allow him to carry out his will at all."[77] As the historian read the apostle, the spirit extended into every domain of human existence. However, Gunkel emphasized more than once the spirit came only after faith, but when it did arrive, he held, that spirit caused a rupture with the past, whether that past be Jewish or nullifidian.[78] "Between the Christian's life now and his Jewish or heathen past," he concluded, "there is no psychological means of building a span or of explaining the later from the earlier. Christian existence comes into being through a break, through the intervention of something supernatural, something new, that is, through the intervention of the Spirit of God."[79] In consequence, the Christian life proved "absolutely inconceivable" to anyone outside.[80] For Gunkel, as for Harnack, the Christian was thus "a miracle of God."[81] The divine spirit had become desupernaturalized after all.[82]

If he had kept the ancients ancient, even primitive, Gunkel made the apostle Paul a perfectly modern Protestant. The apostle had overcome the intellectual cleavage between the ancient and the modern that the historian himself had hewn. So it was that Paul apparently affirmed the importance of experience, the precedence of faith before the spirit, the primacy of practice over doctrine, and the priority of ethics for the Christian community. In this way, Gunkel may have embarked upon his journey into the ancient past with a different course in mind, but his historiographic ship seemed to land at the same theological destination as his predecessors had. Klatt, too, has considered whether Gunkel's ostensible "discovery" of experience and ecstasy actually led to a new conception of prophecy or whether it ultimately remained within a much longer line of romantic, rationalistic, and liberal interpretation of biblical texts and the history of early Christianity:

> romantic because it introduces the category of the mysterious into the conception of revelation by way of ecstasy; rational because it then still seeks to understand this mystery psychologically; finally liberal because its primary interest is unidirectionally set on the

[76] Ibid., 93.
[77] Ibid., 93–94. On the question of possession – and who possesses whom – cf. esp. 31, 42, 44, 51–52, 68–69, 82.
[78] Ibid., 91, 94.
[79] Ibid., 95.
[80] Ibid., 94.
[81] Ibid., 96.
[82] On this specific dimension of Gunkel's work, cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 333–34; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 43.

religiosity and morality of prophetic persons and their proclamation, despite an exegetical recognition of the important function of prophetic augury.[83]

Indeed, Gunkel may well have insisted on a greater attention to genealogy, a sharper focus on other, especially Jewish, sources, and a fuller recognition of the sensual and the irrational dimensions of past religion, but for better or worse, he was not nearly so radical as some might like to suggest, at least at this early stage in his career. Such a rawer view of Christian origins only deepened the contrast for theological understandings allegedly instituted by Paul and ones certainly far more palatable to a modern bourgeois faith.

5.2.2 Embracing Sources Outside the Canon

Gunkel did not escape the preferences and priorities of his forebears, nor did he abandon the theoretical and methodological apparatus in operation when he started. His stress on both a wider and a deeper portrait of the past, colored by an expanded set of sources, his emphasis on individual experience of religion, and his accent on the great personalities of old all endured even as his sets of data changed. Such concerns arose again when he transitioned from the New Testament to early Jewish literature, especially 2 Esdras.

Be it in correspondence he composed or the courses he offered to students, in reviews he wrote of others' work or the contributions of his own, the young biblical scholar occupied himself with apocalyptic Judaism until the turn of the twentieth century, which meant this thematic occupation went with him to Berlin.[84] While Gunkel addressed the eschatological dimension of Jewish apocalyptic literature for his Göttingen habilitation lecture, of 1888, he delivered a similar presentation for re-habilitation in Halle, seven months thereafter, which examined the place of eschatological hope in Judaism between the Testaments Old and New.[85] Serving as a private docent in Halle, Gunkel published three reviews on the subject of early Judaism.[86] Though often overlooked as a source

[83] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 207, cf. 34–35; cf. Karsten Lehmkühler, *Kultus und Theologie. Dogmatik und Exegese in der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule* (Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 190 n. 51. In an 1892 review, Gunkel conceded, "It is nevertheless indubitable that we moderns search for psychological explanations where our fathers uncritically believed in miracles" (idem, review of *Vorträge über die Offenbarung Gottes auf alttestamentlichem Boden*, by August Bender, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 17, no. 6 [1892]: 155–58, at 157).

[84] Cf. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 54–55, 105–06; for his publications, see ibid., 394.

[85] Ibid., 38, 52–53. The Göttingen manuscript survives, while the Halle one apparently does not. For Gunkel's wider views on Judaism, see ibid., 265–81.

[86] Hermann Gunkel, review of *Das 4. Buch Esra, auf seine Quellen untersucht*, by Richard Kabisch, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 16 (1891): 5–11; idem, review of *Die Apokryphen des A. T.'s, nebst einem Anhang über die Pseudepigraphenlitleratur* (*sic*), by Otto Zöckler, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 17, no. 2 (1892): 126–30; idem, review of *Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes im Neuen Testament*, by Ernst Issel, *Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*,

for intellectual development and debate, these reviews can offer ready insight into the thematic territory the historian was seeking to claim, into the operative criteria for assessing failures and successes, into the assumptions of theory and method either shared or at issue, and into scholarly networks in their cooperation and opposition.

Since this chapter seeks to demonstrate how the hallmarks of Gunkel's academic labors were, in fact, already present early on – before he had transitioned to the Old Testament and to Berlin – the inquiry now turns, chronologically, to his work on Jewish apocalyptic literature and, thematically, beyond the features evident in his study of the spirit in early Christianity. Across these investigations of early Judaism, his pursuit of individual experience, of historical embededdness, and of inspired personalities continued to emerge as well. But here he also started to experiment with still other ventures, ones that eventually became characteristic of his interpretation. Gunkel contemplated the very nature of authorship in two distinguishable senses: in the composition history of literature and the proper means of understanding ancient authors themselves. Furthermore, he exhibited an incipient interest in reaching beyond the upper echelons of biblical scholarship, in taking his research to a larger audience – a commitment that would become a real preoccupation of his as the crisis of modernity intensified at the turn of the twentieth century.

In 1891, Gunkel issued his first review on Jewish apocalyptic literature. He evaluated a work by Richard Kabisch (1868–1914), who subsequently turned into a noted educationist. True to its title as well as the times, the treatise separated the text of 4 Ezra into several different sources, thereby arguing for a complicated composition history.[87] If Gunkel accepted the literary divisions as set forth by Kabisch, he finally rejected the conclusions reached about them. The reviewer posed a question that he clearly hoped to affirm, postulating, "whether these distinct groups do not stem from a [single] writer and through his spirit formed a whole."[88] First, Gunkel adopted what Adela Yarbro Collins has termed a "psychological approach" to the composition, whereby textual tensions revealed but a

by Otto Schmoller, and *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, by Johannes Weiss, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 18, no. 1 (1893): 39–45.

[87] For an overview of Kabisch's contributions to apocalyptic literature, see Matthias Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 142; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 55–53; cf. idem, "4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: The Status Quaestionis," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, ed. idem and Gabriele Boccaccini (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 164; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 3–27. On Kabisch's pedagogical work, see Veit-Jakobus Dieterich, *Religionslehrplan in Deutschland (1870–2000). Gegenstand und Konstruktion des evangelischen Religionsunterrichts im religionspädagogischen Diskurs und in den amtlichen Vorgaben* (Arbeiten zur Religionspädagogik 29; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 185–89.

[88] Gunkel, review of *Das 4. Buch Esra,* by Kabisch, 7.

complexity of person.[89] The ancient author, in this assessment, thus had "a complicated nature, a man of deep yet not entirely uniform (*einheitlich*) thought."[90] Second, Gunkel contended the writer had availed himself of preexistent sources, which could account for further ruptures in the text. (This assertion still proceeded from an interpretive world centered on literacy rather than orality.) Gunkel saw a unity in diversity: a composite work, in consequence, did not preclude all or any individual genius.

Once Gunkel had located – or rather claimed – the presence of a single if admittedly complex author, he then hoped to apprehend that ancient personality. Such complicated ancients fascinated the modern. Gunkel spoke of "eavesdrop[ping] on them in their thought and feeling" as well as "recogniz[ing] and understand[ing] the perhaps multiply varying nuances of their thought."[91] Moreover, the historian placed emphasis on empathy for interpretation. Gunkel criticized Kabisch for showing "no heartfelt, warm understanding of his author. Denying (*Absprechen*) is truly easier than understanding; and a work like IV Ezra will only be understood in affection (*Liebe*) and devoted submission. Through tears and prayers was this work written."[92] He further stressed the need for differentiating between problems then and now: intellectual quandaries for the modern may well have caused no issue for the ancient, he contended.[93] Gunkel therefore called attention to "the most beautiful yet most difficult task of the exegete, to read between the lines of his text."[94] With this first piece of criticism on Jewish apocalyptic literature, he accentuated the originality of an ancient author and argued this kind of creativity could manifest itself even in the adaptation of other sources. Originality therefore did not have to stop at origins, and editors – as opposed to authors – infused their own spirit in their use of older material. Gunkel concluded his assessment with a reflection from Goethe: "For if one pushes aside problems that can only be explained dynamically, then mechanical kinds of explanation again become the order of the day."[95] If Gunkel sought anything in his interpretation, then it was this very dynamism.

A second review followed the following year. In 1892, Gunkel evaluated Zöckler's *Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, nebst einem Anhang über die Pseudepigraphenliteratur*, and in the process he presented his own views. Neither for the first nor for the last time, Gunkel promoted the "history of religion's methods,"

---

[89] Adela Yabro Collins, "The Uses of Apocalyptic Eschatoloty," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, ed. Henze and Boccaccini, 253–70, at 254; cf. also, Karina Martin Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 130; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 21–22.

[90] Gunkel, review of *Das 4. Buch Esra*, by Kabisch, 7, cf. 10, 11.

[91] Ibid.

[92] Ibid., 8.

[93] Ibid.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Ibid., 11.

championed the study of apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature, and advocated the recognition of such writings as "the topsoil of early Christianity (*Mutterboden des Urchristenthums*)."[96] Contrary to Zöckler, he distinguished (Palestinian) apocrypha from apocalyptic before proceeding to place them in a chronological series. These two genres "so fundamentally differ in their religious conceptions (*Anschauungen*)," opined Gunkel, "that the former express a this-worldly conception while in the latter a belief in a coming age and in the resurrection dominates everything."[97] Such belief – "with its enormous importance for piety" – not only "clearly divides the history of Judaism into two parts" but also constitutes "the deep trench that separates the apocrypha and the apocalypses."[98] Consequently, Gunkel claimed they represented "not two movements of one and the same period" but rather "two ages" altogether: "the apocrypha the ending of the Old Testament, the apocalypses the preparation of the New."[99] This scheme still relied upon the (or, more properly, a) Christian canon to provide – more than a reference – a veritable framework for classifying and interpreting ancient literature. Even more, the chronological arrangement permitted Gunkel to prioritize that literature in a hierarchical series based upon its temporal proximity to and thus its interpretive relevance for early Christian texts. For this reason, he maintained, "the explication of the New Testament from the history of religion's framework will have little to learn from the apocrypha and much from the apocalypses."[100] Gunkel could therefore state that 2 Esdras "contributes to historical understanding of the New Testament more than any other writing of Judaism."[101] The value of Jewish texts depended on their significance for understanding the Christian past.

Even as Gunkel contemplated the finer points of textual history in 2 Esdras, he underscored the necessity for a scholarship as scrupulous as it was accessible. Already in the second paragraph of his review, Gunkel called into question Zöckler's proposed distinction between a learned and a more popular audience, between "scholarly interest" and "the interest of broader theological circles."[102] But he clearly did approve of the author's focus on "beginners," "students," and "broader theological circles," which he noted on each of the four pages to his critical appraisal and which differed from the intended audience of the rival series "Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes." Nevertheless, Gunkel faulted Zöckler for an exegetical commentary far too

[96] Gunkel, review of *Die Apokryphen des A. T.'s, nebst einem Anhang über die Pseudepigraphenliteratur*, by Zöckler, 127.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid., 128.
[102] Ibid., 127. Zöckler had oriented his work towards the latter.

inattentive to "biblical theology."[103] More indicting still was the objection Gunkel articulated over more than half of his review: namely, the nature of translation. The reviewer may have praised the author for rendering the ancient texts into the German tongue, but he found considerable failing in the outcome because of the apparent dependency on others' work, which, at certain points, allegedly resulted less in a translation than revision. Apart from his critique of the German itself, Gunkel reprimanded the theory he perceived beneath it, asking, "What is the purpose of a translation that is not also an explanation of the text but simply reproduces the difficulties in the text?"[104] Finally, in his comments on Zöckler's commentary, Gunkel articulated, too, the necessity of understanding the place of apocalyptic in larger historical developments, on the one hand, and making those texts understandable for a larger public, on the other.

Yet another year brought yet another review, in fact a trifold one. The three works under consideration considered the kingdom of God as conceived in the New Testament and early Christianity. In examining these examinations, Gunkel trod familiar ground, for he himself had written on the subject in his own dissertation. As he assessed these volumes, the reviewer availed himself of the opportunity to express not only his opinions on the topic at hand but also his convictions on theory and method more generally. In fact, Gunkel even ended the piece with a list of prescriptions for future work in the field. First, he distinguished between the methods for analyzing literature and those for studying the history of religion. Gunkel equated (or at least associated) the "historical" method with "biblical-theological investigation" – a form of inquiry in pursuit of the "inner nexus" that "the ideas originally had in the spirit of the author or the epoch," which he then contrasted with a "literary connection" (*Zusammenhang*) that transmitted those ideas only coincidentally.[105] More specifically, he drew contrasts between analyses diachronic and synchronic and between form and content, two analytical pairings on which he would meditate significantly throughout his academic labors. Secondly, Gunkel differentiated between the study of concepts or ideas (*Begriffe*) and world views (*Anschauungen*), whereby he highlighted the historical, i. e., ancient, embeddedness of the latter.[106] In the process, he underlined the eschatological understanding of the divine kingdom in antiquity (contra Ritschl) and underscored the significance of religious history for interpretation. Gunkel placed a Jesus link in the chain of post-exilic prophecy through apocalyptic Judaism to the early Christian church.[107] The distinction between ancient (Jewish)

[103] Ibid., 128.

[104] As he would do time and again, Gunkel lauded the translations created by Wellhausen (ibid., 129).

[105] Gunkel, review of *Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes im Neuen Testament*, by Issel, *Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, by Schmoller, and *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, by Weiß, 40.

[106] Ibid., 42, cf. 44.

[107] Ibid., 41–42.

and modern conceptions of the state also rose in this discussion, alongside a word of interpretive caution against projecting contemporary understandings onto ideas from the past. Third, Gunkel emphasized the ethics in Jesus' teaching. On his reading of the ancient sources, such an eschatological framework did not preclude the expectation that certain ethical obligations be upheld. He further opined the command of Jesus to love, on the one hand, and Jesus' opposition to the Pharisees, on the other, required further analysis, too.[108]

His clear, and even admitted, convergence with so many of the arguments advanced throughout these works – especially the one by Weiß – afforded Gunkel more space to reflect on his divergence. At the end of this trifold review, he offered a list of desiderata that quickly became prescriptive – and, in part, redundant. His first point, of fifteen total, claimed a work of "biblical theology" should not be mere "concordance work" and urged the study of ideas instead of words. In addition, he saw a knowledge of Judaism essential for any proper comprehension of the New Testament – no matter one's ultimate assessment of Jesus' precise relationship to Judaism – and suggested, once again, that "historical exegesis" required an analysis of the apostolic fathers. Furthermore, Gunkel insisted an all too common search for dogmatic concepts in antiquity hindered proper historical study, and he claimed a true understanding of any idea implicit in the New Testament (such as, in the context of his review, the kingdom of God) necessitated a sustained inquiry into what Jews had believed, as reflected in the literature that ranged from the Old Testament through early Jewish texts up through the New Testament. Even more, the historian in Gunkel demanded a clean break between ancient and modern understandings, reiterating the obligation of avoiding any projection onto the past. Moreover, he affirmed the multiplex nature of the intellectual past, how terms and concepts evident in literature could themselves already have had complicated histories of their own before any subsequent adoption, adaptation, or reinterpretation in the early Christian context.[109] Most provocative of all, however, Gunkel pronounced, "Since the gos[pel] contains no system in which every individual component would be oriented around a central point, the individual conceptions of the [kingdom] stand to some extent in a very loose connection."[110] Perhaps there was no center that could hold it all together.

Gunkel continued to labor in the field of early Jewish literature with writings of his own, rather than reviews of others'. In 1900, seven years after this third evaluation – and five into his tenure at Berlin – he published on 2 Esdras in several different venues.[111] His most technical work appeared in volume two of Kautzsch's *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, where his

[108] Ibid., 43.
[109] Ibid., 45.
[110] Ibid.
[111] For closer examination of these efforts, which postdated his transition to Berlin and the Old Testament, see Klatt (*Hermann Gunkel*, 36–40) and Hammann (*Hermann Gunkel*, 105–13).

contribution covered a full seventy pages of concentrated commentary, copious notes, and elegant translation. Gunkel also issued a separate printing of his translation alongside an accessible introduction to the text.[112] That same introduction he printed, in slightly modified form, as an independent article in the *Preußische Jahrbücher*, which he titled "The Prophet Ezra: An Ancient Jewish Philosopher of Religion."[113]

In all these undertakings, Gunkel sculpted the material he had loosed through scientific philology and shaped it with the chisel of his personal proclivities. He expressed appreciation of the universal spirit displayed in 2 Esdras, of the piety evident in the text, and of its author's literary art. Further still, he spied the personage behind the composition, elevated him above other (Jewish) apocalyptic writers, and hailed him the most sympathetic of all. In fact, Gunkel valued the complex, even tortured nature of the artist so much so as to note an affinity with Paul, although he nonetheless felt compelled to assert the apostle's unquestionable greatness.[114] Such inspired persons Gunkel sought to resuscitate through the rest of his career. In his piece from the *Preußische Jahrbücher*, Gunkel went so far as to label him a "prophet" and to claim actual events (*Thatsachen*) and experiences stood behind the text.[115] He believed this "intelligible and congenial (*sympathisch*)" personality "ought to have our reverence and love (*Ehrfurcht und Liebe*)" and "does not deserve to have been so completely forgotten."[116] The modern therefore sought to save this ancient from oblivion. Indeed, Gunkel felt a clear connection to the person he saw in the text. So it was this poet-historian penned some verse of his own, in 1902, on the book of 2 Esdras. He lyricized, "How many days have I sat there / And reflected on its words. / Venerable book, not all forgotten are you; / once more I will pull you from the dark night. / Now rise again upon the old sages, / And where you find hearts speak quietly."[117] With these words, Gunkel suggested already a crucial venture that eventually defined his work on the Hebrew Bible: an empathetic exegesis – an attempt to identify ancient and modern, the author and the reader. The study of the past was important for the present. It thus demanded a specific kind of inquiry.

---

[112] Hermann Gunkel, *Der Prophet Esra. (IV Esra.)* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1900). He did alter the translation at certain points, however: cf. ibid., xxxii n. 1.

[113] Hermann Gunkel, "Der Prophet Esra, ein antiker jüdischer Religionsphilosoph," *Preußische Jahrbücher* 99 (1900): 498–519, cf. 503 n. 1. He redescribed the philosophy of religion as theodicy (ibid., 501). By this point, Hans Delbrück (1848–1929) helmed the journal alone, having committed editorial patricide of Heinrich von Treitschke (1834–1896).

[114] On all these aspects, see especially idem, "Das vierte Buch Esra," 342–43, 348–49; idem, "Der Prophet Esra, ein antiker jüdischer Religionsphilosoph," 501–02, 517–19.

[115] Gunkel, "Der Prophet Esra," 517–518; cf. idem, "Das vierte Buch Esra," 342; idem, *Der Prophet Esra*, xxi–xxii.

[116] Gunkel, "Der Prophet Esra, ein antiker jüdischer Religionsphilosoph," 501–02.

[117] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 38–39; cf. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 108.

5.2.3 Diffusing the Situation

In 1894, Gunkel issued *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*. As Hammann has observed, the title provided its readers with plenty of room for repartee.[118] When Baumgartner asked his teacher why he had chosen to invert the cosmogonic sequence as reported in the Bible, listing creation before *tohubohu*, Gunkel answered he had sought to avoid the reference "Gunkel Chaos." Neither friend nor foe could resist the quip, however.[119] Whereas Wellhausen disparaged, to Harnack, "*Schöpfung und Chaos* is a defining title for your *novissimus*; but chaos prevails," Wrede praised his former colleague "for making creation out of chaos," while Smend (Sr.) apparently split the difference: "The book has a fortunate title; it is truly part creation, part chaos."[120] Verbal plays aside, Gunkel's monograph was certainly creative. Historian Eduard Meyer (1855–1930) hailed it "epoch-making" and predicted, "it will require intense labor and manifold discussion until science has reaped all the fruit to which he has opened the path."[121] His forecast proved correct. Laborers in the field of ancient history and literature still gather yield from those areas of inquiry to which Gunkel showed the way, even if other paths he cut with the work may have led to more barren ground.

With this exploration, Gunkel consolidated those priorities and principles which would come to characterize his vision of biblical scholarship. His charge to open the sources of investigation, to stretch the confines of chronology, to reach inspired personalities of old, and to access the world of ancient experience all emerged in the volume. There, too, he hoped to save still others from obscurity. The monograph integrated a number of distinguishable lines of analysis into a coherent project of historiography. In many ways, however, this program – reflective as it was of larger movements in the human sciences – stretched the norms that had taken shape in the course of the nineteenth century. Gunkel seemed to know full well how innovative (or unorthodox) his undertaking was.

---

[118] Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 72–74; see also the appraisals cited in Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 79.

[119] Baumgartner, "Zum 100. Geburtstag von Hermann Gunkel," 3.

[120] Wellhausen to Harnack, December 21, 1894, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 326; William Wrede, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 21, no. 24 (1896): 623–31, at 624; Rudolf Smend, review of *Hermann Gunkel. Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode*, by Werner Klatt, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 26 (1970): 367–70, at 369. Klatt mistakenly attributes the Wrede quote to Meyer (*Hermann Gunkel*, 70, cf. 70 n. 2), an error reproduced in Kurtz, "Axes of Inquiry," 248.

[121] Eduard Meyer, "Der babylonische Einfluß auf Judenthum und Christenthum. Ein Bericht über die Untersuchungen H. Gunkels," *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* (Munich) 287 (December 13, 1894): 1–5, at 5. The same description came from Carl Clemen, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 68 (1895): 619–30, at 619.

Suited to its subtitle, the book traversed the Bible. Still six months before it first appeared, the text was yet entitled "Schöpfung und Chaos in AT u[nd] NT," and just prior to its publication, Gunkel dispensed with his earlier plan to bill the book as volume one in a series called "Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen."[122] It ranged from the first chapter of Genesis to the last of Revelation. But in fact, it stretched much further, encompassing material far outside the canon: from ancient texts wedged in Akkadian, extracted from Mesopotamia, and dated to the mid second millennium BCE; through Jewish apocalyptic and early Christian writings extant mostly in Greek, produced largely in Syria-Palestine, and composed at the turn of the common era; to a neoplatonic treatise written in Greek, rooted in Athens, and penned in the early sixth century CE.[123] Gunkel even cited a reference from the Sumerian Early Dynastic period, which his chronology attributed to the fourth millennium BCE: this (overestimated) calculation meant his monograph covered a period of 4,000 years or so.[124] Furthermore, he included the expected Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, of course, but even more than Akkadian, he embraced Sumerian (not yet established as a tongue of its own), Sam'alian, Aramaic, Phoenician, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Old South Arabic – a sum of different languages dwarfed only by their centrifugal variations diachronically and synchronically, ie., in dialects, in geography, and in epochs.[125]

But to build his analytical bridge across these gaps in language, space, and time, Gunkel required help from other laborers with their own expert knowledge. While the author claimed – if questionably – that he had exercised restraint in venturing too deep into foreign intellectual terrain (even despite the draw for

[122] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 51–52.

[123] This third element came from Joseph Kopp's edition of Damascius (*Damasciou diadochou aporiae kai auseis peri ton proton archon. Damascii philosophi Platonici quaestiones de primis principiis ad finem* [Frankfurt: Broenneri, 1826], ch. 125); see the recent English edition, Sara Ahbel-Rappe, *Damascius' Problems & Solutions Concerning First Principles* (AAR Religion in Translation; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[124] Citing an edition by Peter Jensen in Eberhard Schrader's *Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischen Texten in Umschrift und Übersetzung* (Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek 3/1), which relied heavily on earlier work, Gunkel misrepresented somewhat a general reluctance to – or in the very least caution in – dating these early texts with his simple parenthetical attribution of Ur-Nina of Lagash to the fourth millennium BCE, demonstrating rather little familiarity with the relevant literature (Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 27; cf. also Zimmern's note at ibid., 27); for an overview of this early research, see Samuel Noah Kramer, *The Sumerians: Their History, Culture, and Character* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 19–25. Recent scholarship has dated Ur-Nina/Ur-Nanshe up to the mid third millennium BCE.

[125] As for Old South Arabic, the English translation of Gunkel cites "the Zabishes" – on analogy with the Zincirli inscriptions, the Targumim, and the Nineveh weights (idem, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton*, 292 n. 8, but cf. 358 n. 92); in the first half of the nineteenth century, however, *Zabisch* ostensibly served as a biform of *Sabäisch* (cf., e. g., Friedrich Adelung, *Uebersicht aller bekannten Sprachen und ihrer Dialekte* [St. Petersburg: Gretsch, 1820], 27; Wilhelm Gesenius, "Paläographie," in *Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste,* ed. M. H. E. Meier and L. F. Kämtz, Vol. 3.9 [Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1837], 287–316, at 310).

such an "international topic"), he availed himself of specialists in other fields of study.[126] He found allies in Zimmern for Akkadian, Franz Praetorius (1847–1927) for Ethiopic, Eugene Petersen (1836–1919) along with Konrad Wernicke (1862–1900) for classics, Rudolf Stübe (1870–1930) for "Jewish-Babylonian magical texts," and Meyer on multiple fronts.[127] All of them, and others still, Gunkel acknowledged in his foreword. Moreover, the biblical scholar depended, quite heavily at times, on others' compilations for his comparisons: such as Zimmern's cuneiform translations, which he appended to his tome, Dillmann's assemblage of cosmogonies and theogonies, and Ferdinand Wilhelm Weber's (1836–1879) "Jewish systematic theology."[128] True, this diffusionary, or monogenetic, endeavor undertaken by Gunkel did not sprawl quite in the way James George Frazer's (1854–1941) comparative *Golden Bough* had several years earlier, but Gunkel nonetheless collected a large amount of produce from academic fields not only neighboring his own but also far afield. Though otherwise a sympathizer with the cause that Gunkel championed, a young Nathan Söderblom (1866–1931) asked in his review of the work where the pursuit of diffusion – *vis-à-vis* independent origination – should properly end for such an inquiry.[129]

[126] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, viii.

[127] For overlap between Petersen and Gunkel (et al.), see the meticulous De Valerio, *Altes Testament und Judentum im Frühwerk Rudolf Bultmanns*, 146, 183 n. 425, 297 n. 187. Gunkel coordinated few given with these surnames that he referenced, which can muddle their identification. Although the English translation differentiates the acknowledged (Ernst) and cited (Konrad) Wernicke, Gunkel probably referred to the latter on both occasions. In the first instance, he employed the status *Privatdozent*; in the second, Dr. The now obscure Loburg pastor Ernst did publish on medieval ecclesiastical archaeology, but he received a(n honorary) doctorate only in 1902, long after Gunkel's publication (cf. Otto Tschirch, "Zur Erinnerung an D. Ernst Wernicke," *Jahrbuch für Brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte* 11–12 [1914]: 351–53). Already in 1884, by contrast, classicist Konrad had earned his Dr. phil. for the treatise *De Pausaniae periegetae studiis herodoteis*, and in 1889 he obtained his habilitation (cf. Botho Graef, "Konrad Wernicke," *Biographisches Jahrbuch für die Altertumswisenschaft* 32 [1909]: 110–14). Writing much on myth, Konrad discussed the serpentine dragon Ladon in mythology, with a diffusionary perspective no less (idem, "Atlas 3," in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. Georg Wissowa, Vol. 2.2 [4], *Artemisia–Barbaroi* [Stuttgart: Metzler, 1896]: 2119–33, esp. 2127–31). Stübe studied with Zimmern as well as Kautzsch (cf. Stübe, *Jüdisch-babylonische Zaubertexte* [Halle: Krause, 1895], v, xii–xiii).

[128] He cited August Dillmann, *Genesis*, 6th ed. (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1892) [ET: *Genesis, Critically and Exegetically Expounded*, 2 vols., trans. W. B. Stevenson (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1897)]; and Ferdinand Wilhelm Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud dargestellt*, ed. Franz Delitzsch and Georg Schnedermann, 1st ed. (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1880) [repr., with a new title, *Die Lehren des Talmud, quellenmässig, systematisch und gemeinverständlich dargestellt* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum 2/1; Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1886)]; 2nd ed. published as *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften gemeinfasslich dargestellt* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1897). On Weber, see Deines, *Die Pharisäer*, 245–55; Waubke, *Die Pharisäer in der protestantischen Bibelwissenschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 250–56.

[129] Nathan Söderblom, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 35 (1897): 356–69, at 361–63; cf. also Clemen, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Gunkel, 630.

Others criticized Gunkel closer to home, in his own backyard of biblical texts – some with little sympathy at all. With a good seventy-five years of German positivism only now beginning to wane, such an explicit admission of indebtedness (apart from the requisite thanks to patrons) would have doubtless seemed unseemly, as would have his outright unapologetic confession of philological limitations. Both Smend and Friedrich Giesebrecht (1852–1910) launched this rather foreseeable criticism – complete with all the pedantry standard for that time – when they reviewed the work. Each faulted Gunkel on textual and linguistic particularities. If Giesebrecht located, with some derision, Gunkel's talent and primary focus (*Hauptgebiet*) in "aesthetic reasoning," Smend closed his assessment with a judgment as straight as it was snide: "[The book] verifies all the more certainly that [Gunkel] is not made for research on the Old Testament. He is incapable of distinguishing between historical and philological evidence and abstract possibility without Old Testament scholarship having to become a playground of fantasy."[130] They would not have been alone in controverting the statement he himself had written to his publisher before the book appeared: "I am not, admittedly, skilled in the Bab[ylonian] language, but [I] do still believe [myself] able to judge, if only relatively, after many years of work with Bab[ylonian] antiquity."[131] For them, as for many ancient historians, philological prowess was the *sine qua non* of science. The theological stakes of historicity having been lowered in the course of the nineteenth century, textual and grammatical errors – or hypotheses insufficiently argued – were some of the few heresies left for biblical scholars to fight. Gunkel, however, was asking different questions. To answer them, he had to journey elsewhere.

Reawakened from its slumber, the spirit of Creuzer began to animate anew the study of the ancient world at the end of the nineteenth century, an intellectual life force driving scholars toward the oriental and symbolic, the mythological and borrowed, the mysterious and sensuous, the religious and all-encompassing.[132] It blew strong through Gunkel's work. Now, as he published his creation, the commanding forces of high liberal, positivist historicism had far from dissipated. After all, biblical critic Eduard König (1846–1936) issued a six-hundred-page installment of his three-tome Hebrew grammar while semitist Carl Brockelmann (1868–1956) released his almost equally massive *Lexicon Syriacum*, both

[130] Friedrich Giesebrecht, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 157, no. 8 (1895): 585–602, at 589, cf. 592; Rudolf Smend (Sr.), review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 16, no. 26 (1895): 801–05, at 805.

[131] Gunkel to Ruprecht, December 12, 1894, in Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 52.

[132] On the Creuzer Affair and Creuzerism's resurrection at the *fin de siècle*, see Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany*, 121–50; Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, esp. 66–71, 216–17, 231–32; cf. also idem, *Down From Olympus*, 45–47.

in 1895. But a new zeitgeist was turning from growl to roar.[133] Gunkel partook in a recrudescence of mythology as a proper – if not yet fully respectable – field of study, one that had been long left overgrown or cultivated only at the edges amidst a generation of post-romantics, from the 1820s onward. The quest for origins, including those that lay in the East, joined forces with the comparative enterprise, with the discovery of civilizations distant in time or place, and with access to new sources.

As in his other early studies, a theoretical skeleton was already articulated in this monograph, even if the meat of his research on the Hebrew Bible would later make that form all the more conspicuous. The backbone of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* comprised Gunkel's reflections on content, form, transmission, and individuality. Moving geographically to Berlin and academically to the Old Testament in 1895, he would only continue to flesh out this conceptual structure with his body of work on Israel. Nevertheless, here he sought a single myth in its multiplex manifestations – the tome's table of contents lucidly outlining the argument of the whole. Gunkel saw Genesis 1 as the "Judaized" form of a Babylonian myth and believed the same material undergirded the image of the eschaton in Revelation 12. This fundamental myth, however, he reconstructed through a smattering of fragments come from other sources.[134] In short, Gunkel held it portrayed cosmogony by *Chaoskampf*. This original myth, he believed, had recounted a battle between chaos personified and a deity whose triumph ultimately created the word. The mythos then served as a basis for much later rumination on cosmology and eschatology preserved in the biblical texts.[135]

Gunkel scrutinized his mythic material on two distinguishable planes: content and context. While searching for an actual archetype, that is, the original form of the myth, he also pursued its subsequent transformations in all their diversity. This inquiry into diffusion thus posed questions of whence (where and when) as

[133] Eduard König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache,* 2 vols. in 3 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1881–97); Carl Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, with a preface by Theodor Nöldeke (Edinburgh: T & T Clark/Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1895). For Brockelmann's own reminiscence on this work, see Rudolf Sellheim, "Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen und Erinnerungen von Carl Brockelmann," *Oriens* 27/28 (1981): 1–65.

[134] In both German and British venues, ally Thomas Kelly Cheyne stressed his own status as a forerunner to Gunkel's work: idem, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel, *The Critical Review of Theological & Philosophical Literature* 5, no. 3 (1895): 256–66; idem, "Note on Gunkel's Schöpfung und Chaos," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 15, no. 1 (1895): 179; cf. idem, "The Text of Job," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 9, no. 4 (1897): 573–80, at 580. Barton would also emphasize his own anticipation of Gunkel's cosmogonic theory, contending, "If there is any truth in the hypothesis, the credit of its first discovery belongs to America rather than Germany" (G. A. Barton, "Recent German Theories of Foreign Influences in the Bible," *The Biblical World* 31, no. 5 [1908]: 336–47, at 337). In his own review of the work, Giesebrecht took obvious delight in enumerating all of Gunkel's predecessors in this regard.

[135] See especially Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 111–14, 114–17, 169–70, 385–98.

well as those of why and how (the reasons and conditions for change over time). Wearing the mythologist's hat, he maintained, "the Babylonian Tiamat-Marduk myth was borrowed by Israel and here became a Yahweh myth," which he conceptualized as "the same myth, which is preserved in two different recension families"; however, rather than rest content in asserting mere similitude, Gunkel wanted to grasp the trajectory of mutation, from start to finish: "To comprehend the grand history from which Gen 1 must be understood, it is first essential to establish the singularity (*Eigentümlichkeit*) of this recension."[136] Still, this expert of ancient literature offered little insight into the criteria for identifying sameness or judging their relationship. What might constitute a myth in and of itself, which elements either in quantity or quality would constitute the critical mass to justify an assertion of continuity, and under which circumstances a subsequent transformation should qualify as a new creation all its own saw no rigorous discussion. Within the wider framework of determining monogenetic or polygenetic relations, the lack of articulation in a theory to warrant such judgments exposed Gunkel to charges of superficial equation or parallelomania. Even an approving Carl Clemen, in his review of the work, noted that mustering all possible data made the stronger evidence actually seem weaker.[137]

In the history of Israel – which for Gunkel, as for the majority of Christian theologians, also incorporated that of the early church as well – the specter of Babylonia materialized in other guises, too. Significantly, he saw this cosmogonic *Chaoskampf* as but one of many myths from Babylonia that Israel had borrowed, a list that ranged from Paradise through the Deluge and Tower of Babel to Nimrod and beyond.[138] Not only did Gunkel believe Mesopotamian dominance in Syria-Palestine had brought with it a real impact on a series of different myths, but he also averred its influence had extended into a number of other cultural productions, including agricultural measures, procedures for closing contracts, craftsmanship, fashionable textiles, positions of repose, architectural design, and religious institutions.[139]

However, in his comments on cultural contact, Gunkel held a standard if largely implicit (and not unproblematic) notion of Canaanite *vis-à-vis* Babylonian culture, which mapped onto the opposition of an earthy *Naturvolk* and a developed *Kulturvolk*.[140] Granting the imprimatur of scientific historiography to the biblical narrative – with its account of early Hebrews, or would-be Israelites, who had entered Syria-Palestine and undergone "Canaanization" – the historian perceived two fundamental oppositional forces in Mesopotamia and Syria-Pal-

[136] Ibid., 114, 117–18.
[137] Clemen, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Gunkel, 630.
[138] Cf. his own recapitulation: Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 155.
[139] See ibid., 149–55.
[140] Cf. ibid., 4, 11–12, 15–16, 115, 121–22, 163. However, he did not use this specific terminology here.

estine.[141] He thus suggested an absorption of Canaanite material into the legends of Genesis, an incipient theory that would later drive his celebrated commentary on that biblical book.[142] In any case, Gunkel laid great emphasis on the long and weighty impact of Babylonia on Canaan, whereby he cast the Arameans and Phoenicians as intermediaries or cultural brokers between the two. Absent again were any clear criteria for distinguishing between genuinely "Canaanite" qualities and those transmitted yet still truly "Babylonian" in nature. Unsurprisingly, perhaps, prophecy – which, he argued, showed no substantive effects from Babylonia – was, for Gunkel, Israel's pure religion, constituting "the actual middle point of the Old Testament," i. e., the golden age between a pre-prophetic period of only an inchoate religious distinctiveness against the surrounding nations and a post-prophetic period marked by a fading of its intrinsic religion and a capitulation of Judaism to Babylonian influence.[143]

If Gunkel set his sights upon that moving target of a myth transmitted over space and time, he also fixed his gaze upon its stages in this process. On the second page of his volume (and as a heading in its table of contents), he promptly offered a polemic: "Gen 1 is not a free construction by the author."[144] With such a statement, this historian of ancient worlds directly challenged Wellhausen, a figure who could serve conveniently as the paragon for an entire generation set on the study of literary sources. Instead, Gunkel placed a premium on the "prehistory" of literature, that is, not the composition history of extant literary wholes from their smaller, constituent, and coherent textual units – as created by individual authors – but the still tinier, non-textual parts of those units themselves.[145] Though he did not deny the value of separating sources, Gunkel aimed to compensate for what he believed to be an undervaluing of inquiries into the deeper origins, wider tradition, and longer transmission of elements within that literature.[146] When speaking of "recensions," he most often referred not to specific texts but to a more ambiguous tradition. He imagined these traditions as a kind of archipelago with extant textual fragments as its islands:

---

[141] See esp. ibid., 149–52, 168; cf. also Willy Staerk's own elaboration in idem, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 39, n.s. 4 (1896): 320–34, at 329–30.

[142] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 151–52, cf. 209 n. 3.

[143] Ibid., 169.

[144] Ibid., 4, cf. also 14, see, too, 283.

[145] Ibid., 5–6.

[146] See, e. g., ibid., 144 n. 2, 121, 209 n. 3, 233; cf. also Cheyne, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Gunkel, 260. However, Swiss Old Testament scholar Karl Marti (1855–1925) controverted such a contrast, calling attention to the literary drive of Gunkel's own analysis. For example, Gunkel had accepted a proposal by Bonn associate professor Karl Budde (1850–1935) when he upheld two separate layers in the Yahwist's account of Noah: see Karl Marti, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel, *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 14 (1895): 481–83; cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 142–43.

It is the common fate of the older narratives preserved in later form that certain traces once meaningful in the earlier context have been transmitted in the new account (*Relation*) but lost the context in the process. Such old traces, fragments of an earlier whole, without context in the present account and hardly understandable from the conceptual circle of the reporter, betray to the investigator the existence and individual traces of an earlier form of the present narrative.[147]

More specific to the narrative at center in his study, Gunkel spied this single, elemental myth within numerous passages across the biblical texts, albeit in different states of preservation. He therefore stated, "Gen 1 is the only complete recension of the myth that we have from Israel; all others are only allusions, echoes, adaptations."[148] Having identified this core material – a recensioned archetype – Gunkel pursued its various manifestations, through an inquiry into the forms of its preservation and the modes of that transmission. He also argued for the necessity of examining other manifestations both inside and outside the biblical corpus.

One objective, then, was to establish the relationship of these parts to the whole and to determine how this whole in Israel related to its archetype from Babylonia. Meyer rightly redescribed the enterprise as proposed by Gunkel: "to arrive at a history of the ideas, the tradition, and their development and transformation within which the individual literary work constitutes only one and often not even a particularly important station."[149] Thus, the cosmogonic mythos constituted the full and fully Judaized version of a Babylonian one while other traces throughout the Hebrew Bible represented stages in this process. Gunkel held such remnants amounted to earlier stages in the formation that had taken place in Israel. This thesis rested, in part, upon his understanding of human – and consequently literary – development. For instance, he presumed poetry preceded prose historically, which bore implications for how he sequenced the manifestations of his mythic matter.[150] "The task of this research," he asserted, "is to investigate which form the original Babylonian myth has had. It is perhaps not superfluous to emphasize that there are laws (*Gesetze*) for such a task as well."[151] Recognition of these laws could then facilitate a retracing of the developmental path back to the original form, which yielded an entire chain, in reverse, from the archetype through its intermediate transformations. In fact, Gunkel articulated such a venture in as many words: "A scholar can succeed in reconstructing

[147] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 6. At the time, *Relation* denoted relationship (*Verhältnis*) as well as presentation (*Darlegung*) and statement (*Bericht*): cf. *Brockhaus' Konversations-Lexikon*, 14th ed., Vol. 13, *Perugia–Rudersport* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1895), 757.

[148] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 119. He continued, "The reason why no other creation myth has been preserved is clear; Gen 1, filled with a Jewish spirit and congenial to Judaism, suppressed the other recensions" (ibid., cf. also, e. g., 88).

[149] Meyer, "Der babylonische Einfluß auf Judenthum und Christenthum," 2.

[150] Cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 144–45, 184–85, 251–53.

[151] Ibid., 311, cf. also, e. g., 86.

such an ancient mythos only once he has observed from a plethora of examples the law-like (*gesetzmässig*) manner in which myths were transmitted from generation to generation, migrated from nation to nation, and ultimately became legends out of myths."[152] Further still, this enterprise, so Gunkel, constituted a distinct mode of analysis. Just as philology had its own methodological procedures, so also the study of mythology involved operations of its own.[153] These methods then enabled the mythographer to reconstruct such a development.

Accordingly, Gunkel perceived a "sequence of religious history" that ran from the "Marduk myth" through the "poetic recensions of the Yahweh myth" to the account in Genesis, whereby "the Babylonian myth was transferred to Israel," "lost many of its mythological and most of its polytheistic elements there," and "was as completely Judaized as possible in Gen 1."[154] He thought this poetic "recension" had originally come in the form of a hymn. If he regarded the myth of *Chaoskampf* as "from the beginning in Israel a hymn to Yahweh" and reckoned this cosmogony "a hymn by its very nature,"[155] Gunkel seemed to hold the same view – if less explicitly – on the Babylonian original insofar as he could refer to "the entire Marduk–Yahweh hymn."[156] He even spoke of a distinctive hymnic style, which featured a specific grammatical construction, namely, the participle.[157] As Gunkel's center of gravity shifted into the field of Old Testament research, and especially with his commentary on Genesis, he would further delve into this prehistory of "literature," whether the change to prose from poetry, the shift from orality to literacy, or the transformation of materials through different genres.

While Gunkel searched for manifestations of specific content in these inquiries into the past, the matter of setting also featured prominently in such a quest. A real concern with context emerged on several different levels. In the same way he imagined a mythic tradition with its origins in a particular geographic setting (*Sitz*), a deity with a physical home (*Sitz*) as conceptualized in myths, the seven-day week with an historical radix (*Sitz*) in Babylonia, and storm theophanies with a locus (*Sitz*) in "ancient songs" that addressed specific topics, so Gunkel conceived of thoughts themselves as embedded in certain kinds of expression.[158] This more general interest in embeddedness corresponded to his specific, sustained investigation in the volume, too. So he wrote, "[A]t that time, the concept of creation (*Schöpfungsgedanke*) had its nucleus (*Sitz*) in hoary Yahweh hymns, which we must consider in the manner [we do] the 'poetic recensions,' only per-

[152] Ibid., cf. 139–40.
[153] Ibid.
[154] Ibid., 120.
[155] Ibid., 88, 119, cf. esp. 98, 110, 113, 162, 270, 281.
[156] Ibid., 113, cf. 24, 116, 159–60, 169.
[157] Ibid., 99.
[158] Cf. ibid., 4, 16, 123, 148, 155, 104.

haps more archaic yet."[159] Now, Gunkel may not have used the expected word for form or genre here (i. e., *Gattung*), but he did appear to insinuate already that thought had at least some connection to expression, that form was tied to content.[160] Place therefore operated not only for questions about the past regarding the creation and adaptation of cultural phenomena but also for those about cognitive production and articulation.

These early reflections on archetype and recensions, on refractions preserved in extant literature, and on form and content in their most intimate relationship all brought Gunkel to questions of transmission. He located a channel in the oral. As he mulled over the mechanism that had conducted his mythic material along its path across space, time, and peoples, Gunkel postulated, "With the study of myth and legend, we must reckon not only with texts and authors but much more with oral tradition"; more polemically, he averred, "The world does not consist only of men who write books and those who copy them. Modern criticism has frequently overlooked the significance of oral tradition thus far and is all too prone to conclude a literary dependence at every point of contact between two writings."[161] There was indeed, for Gunkel, a world outside the text. Literature thus entailed a much longer, more complex process of production, with ordered documents or coherent sources often representing only the surface of still a deeper history and offering but a glimpse into wider transformations. This move from literature and authors to traditions and communities even earned the biblical scholar accolade from Meyer, the ancient historian.[162]

However, Gunkel reasoned this channel of transmission did not run smooth or straight. The process of transmission – especially by oral means – had therefore led to obscuration. Not only did he conceptualize a tradition in its various transformations as manifest or preserved in partial, fractured form, but he also visualized any tradition as "darkening," that is, losing its original quality, elements, or structure. Gunkel explained the seemingly inevitable process as follows:

> It lies in the very nature of oral tradition, however it may pass so persistently from generation to generation, that it is subject to certain changes; such omissions, additions, relocations that later generations performed on the ancient material betray themselves in the current codification as a result of either the narrative context (which was once unbroken) now demonstrating some unclarities or peculiarities or the individual traces (which made good sense at the time of their formation) now proving neither clear in the current context nor commonly known and therefore appearing particularly abrupt and incomprehensible.

---

[159] Ibid., 162.

[160] Gunkel did allude to *Gattungen* in several separable senses: a specific literary one of creation hymns (ibid., 45), a mixed one between poetry and prose (45 n. 2, 71 n. 1), a stylistic one (45 n. 2, 73, 74 n. 1), a phenomenal one distinguishing between prophecy and apocalyptic (210), and a methodological one as well (218, 219, 225, 234).

[161] Ibid., 135, 58 n. 2, cf. also 143, 195 n. 1, 208–10, 221 n. 3, 239–40, 242 n. 3., 255–256, 378.

[162] Meyer, "Der babylonische Einfluß auf Judenthum und Christenthum," 3.

Just as one discerns the age of a painting by its growing darker, so also one discerns the age of a tradition by such "darkening."[163]

He described this corruption in a morphological sense – as the metamorphosis of an archetype – but not infrequently without evaluation. Such changes occurred on a superficial, or cosmetic, plane as well as on a deeper one; furthermore, these alterations could at times betray hints of intentionality. As Gunkel analyzed his sources and the past to which they attested, he discerned a transmutation from the original Marduk myth through the Yahweh poetic recensions in Israel to the narrative of Genesis in the Hebrew Bible.

Since the process of transmission, with its concomitant darkening, often extended over many generations and much geography, the comparatist could distinguish material contrasts at the end points of these developments. He recognized a "Judaizing" revision of the mythological recension, a conversion to "sober prose" from "antique poesy," and a turn from ancient naiveté to "a higher conception of God."[164] From a natural, national deity rose the creator god. Gunkel traced the roots of his cosmogonic myth (*Schöpfungsmythus*) back to an epoch characterized by belief in cosmogony (*Schöpfungsglauben*).[165] That earlier age, he argued, showed a greater connection of religion to the rhythm of life on the land than the later period suggested by the speculation evident in some biblical texts. Gunkel thus averred, "[r]eligion in general lived much less in the stories of the primeval era than in the present: the joyous harvest feasts, the great wars of Yahweh – these are motifs of the ancient religion. That creation myth, however, was an ancient story, one story alongside the others that were bandied."[166] By contrast, he believed sustained rumination on the finer points of creation did not belong to the "oldest fundamental thought of the Old Testament religion"; instead, such speculation derived from the Jews, being "the first word of the Jewish religion" since Deutero-Isaiah.[167] Like the myth of paradise or the deity's celestial abode, Gunkel maintained this kind of heavy theorizing had come only in the course of exile, under foreign influence.[168] (Although he claimed the original myth had already contained an eschatological dimension, this one-time New Testament scholar contended an acceleration of abstract thinking on that aspect was also catalyzed by the exile and then the dawn of early

[163] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 256, cf. 8 n. 5, 10, 11, 58, 147–49, 189, 261, 270, 298, 321, 356, 371 n. 4, 374, 382.

[164] Ibid., 120; cf. also the relationship between cosmology and historical thought: ibid., 161.

[165] Ibid., 156.

[166] Ibid., 159. Infelicitously, the English translation actually reverses the argument: "The religion generally focused a good bit more on the realm of the primordial accounts than it did on the realm of the present reality …" (Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton*, 104).

[167] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 156.

[168] Ibid., esp. 157, 159–60, 162–63, 170.

Christianity.[169]) According to Gunkel, notions of cosmology and interpretation of the past – "discrete domains by their very nature" – became integrated only much later, thereby facilitating the equation between the god of Israel and the god of creation, which constituted "the first dogma of the [later] religion."[170] Yet he discriminated between knowledge (*Wissen*) and religious thought. By drawing this distinction, he could affirm that Israel had adopted the first from Babylonia, which included understandings of both the history and the physical structuring of the world, but still insist it had infused that framework with its own, distinctive religious beliefs.[171] If Gunkel therefore alleged the original myth had darkened, in one sense, through transmission after inception, he nonetheless proclaimed its subsequent adaption had added luster, in another.

The aim of his study in particular and of the task promoted more generally targeted the reconstruction of this entire history: from an original myth through its complex transformations all across different genres and generations, places and populations. Gunkel himself declared this recreation to be the ultimate objective: "Yet the final goal of the investigation is to reconstruct the original context and give the reasons for its change, that is, to write the history of the tradition."[172] Rather than merely amass the pieces, however, he asserted the historian should put tradition's Humpty Dumpty back together again. Now, Gunkel fully recognized the challenges entailed in such a study (the history of later adaptations or the problem of extant attestations), including the possibility of radical modification, of a transformation in the very substance itself, which could hinder the identification of a shared original material behind its later, disparate forms. Some alterations, he thought, were natural enough insofar as they correlated with much broader stages – or even universal laws – of development: this conceptual framework, with its identification of a single substance multiply transformed, then permitted him to allude to such essentialized categories as "the nature of religion."[173]

This comparative enterprise ultimately allowed Gunkel to determine the distinctive. Whether religion as a human phenomenon or myth as a cultural product, he juxtaposed the common to establish the exceptional. In consequence, the inquiry extended beyond the manifestations of a myth or the means of its transmission to explore the question of singularity among the forms, which led him from the original material and the process of diffusion to the importance of adaptation. First of all, the significance of his mythic substance, transmitted and

[169] Cf. ibid., 170.
[170] Ibid., 161.
[171] Ibid., 169–70.
[172] Ibid. Although he advocated a reassembly of traditions, Gunkel did not always feel compelled to reconstruct each individual text. Psalm 46, for instance, he judged too corrupt to reconstruct (cf. ibid., 100 n. 1, cf. 49 n. 1).
[173] Ibid., 11, cf. also 89–90, 120, 157.

adapted over time, pertained to the culture that performed these operations. As early as his foreword to the volume, Gunkel insisted on the import of ancient Israel. "It is obvious and thoroughly discussed in what follows," he stated at the outset, "that the creation account, though of Babylonian origin, received its proper value (*eigentümlichen Wert*) first in Israel."[174] He defended not only distinction in the people of Israel but also a divine revelation in the unfolding of history. Furthermore, in terms of chronological priority for composition history and historical consequence for the ancient nation, Gunkel saw the center of the Old Testament in prophecy. This institution alone could pride itself on no essential influence from, let alone dependency on, Babylonia.[175] But even material come from elsewhere, as with the cosmogony under review, had undergone a fundamental transformation once it fell into the hands of Israel, he asserted, and this transformation rendered it all the loftier. The author reassured, "Yet the religious concepts that were added to this material in Israel first made the mythos into what it means for us. Babylonian knowledge proves to be fallacious; but our faith rests on Israel's."[176] In fact, he dug the trench between them all the deeper: "The difference between the Babylonian creation account and that of Gen 1 is very great; it could hardly be thought any greater. […] The poetry of the myth has indeed disappeared except for small remains. We have no regrets. For it is filled, in return, with the thoughtsofa (*sic*) higher religion."[177] Rather than reckon these productions of ancient Israel as ersatz, fake, or bogus, Gunkel leveled no critique against them, at least in this regard, for being secondary or derivative. Here, he reversed the usual evaluation of the relationship between original and diffused. This contrast with a template from Babylonia therefore only revealed with greater force and definition the originality of Israel.

If Gunkel could cast aspersions, at times, on his own intellectual forebears, he esteemed the cultural progenitors of Israel and demanded, furthermore, that others do the same.[178] The study of diffusion, of descent over time and space, became a rising tide that lifted all the boats of peoples past. Gunkel submitted, "The theologian would do well to handle also the Marduk myth with piety; one does not honor his parents by thinking little of the ancestors."[179] This call to appreciate the intellectual or spiritual sculptors of Israel thus bore implications for those who had supplied that raw material. Moreover, having placed a premium on "historical reflection" and invoked "the unassailable right and obligation of the historian of religion," this Old Testament theologian gainsaid any special rev-

[174] Ibid., vi.
[175] Ibid., 169, cf. also 131.
[176] Ibid., 170.
[177] Ibid., 118. In this passage of to and fro, Gunkel also opined, " … in Gen 1 we are able to recover the God in whom we believe; all other cosmogonies are, for us, only interesting antiquities" (ibid.). He also saw a difference in aesthetics (ibid., 29).
[178] Cf. ibid., 117.
[179] Ibid.

elation – i. e., divine intervention beyond the normal workings of the universe – even as he hailed the text of Genesis 1 "a milestone in the history of the world, a monument to the revelation of God in Israel."[180] Such a statement documents a tension common in the study of certain pasts – namely, those of privileged ancient peoples – where thoroughgoing historicist principles, on the one hand, and modern cultural values or theological convictions, on the other, could collide. Gunkel may have been wrong when he called the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* of Göttingen an "entirely inner-theological movement," but such statements on revelation – running through an inquiry into myth in the ancient past – betrayed the at times not-so cryptotheological nature of analyses undertaken by him and other scholars of antiquity.

Gunkel's interest in distinction – discovered through comparison – moved beyond the people of Israel within the Middle East to individuals among that people of Israel. Unlike his previous work on Paul or the author of 2 Esdras, the data for ancient myths restricted, by their nature, any narrow focus on specific personalities, and, in fact, this relative dearth of personages coincided with Gunkel's understanding of a more collective, more poetic primitive stage of human development. Nonetheless, while he eschewed too heavy an emphasis on authors, Gunkel could not withstand all allure of personality.[181] Be it the writers of postulated sources in the Pentateuch – the so-called Yahwist (J), Elohist (E), and "Jewish" Priestly one (P) – or the scribe involved in Esther, he did indeed describe the work of separate penmen and judged some of them less inspired, even competent, than others, like the one responsible for the book of Enoch.[182] Prophets such as Amos ("the earliest datable author of Israel") or Isaiah may have availed themselves of older mythic matter, he consented, but that material was merely a shared intellectual property: he therefore could acquit them of direct dependency and, presumably, any counterfeit thereby.[183] Classing the prophets as "preachers" instead of "theologians" – there for Everyman and not just holy men – Gunkel conceived of them as deeply intertwined in the life of the people. He considered their vocation the interpretation of experience, their focus "the God of history."[184] In this way, the Protestant biblical scholar tried to hold together a multifaceted tradition and inspired, independent individuals.

Like the continuity he discerned in diverse subject matter, this comparativist advocated a uniformity in method and in purpose, no matter the material. Just as Gunkel hoped to appreciate the real conceptual transfer between Babylonia and Israel and yet maintain the originality of the latter, so also he expended goodly

[180] Ibid; cf. Clemen, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Gunkel, 623.
[181] Cf., e. g., Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 14, 207–09, 234–35, 255–56, 270.
[182] See, e. g., ibid., 143, 135, 319, 188–89, 191, 289.
[183] Cf. ibid., 82, 40, 101, see also, e. g., 138.
[184] Ibid., 160.

efforts to establish a Christian repurposing of older Jewish (or "Judaized") material in the Apocalypse of John, while also upholding the distinctiveness of the second.[185] He juxtaposed the peoples, the religions, and the traditions of antiquity to ascertain the peculiar character of his own (usually preferred) object of study. Here, too, persons often featured prominently. Whatever his commitment to including early Jewish literature for understanding formative Christianity or embracing that of Mesopotamia for comprehending ancient Israel, the historian of religion preserved (and prioritized) the patrimony between the Old and New Testaments. This expanded web of connections constructed a tapestry of time, space, and culture across which he could trace any number of threads woven together through history – sometimes visible, other times concealed.

For all the coherence affirmed about the past, Gunkel doubtless had his preferences, ones shaped by his heritage and training in Protestant theology. By the dawn of the Christian era, for example, he believed a chasm had yawned between prophetic and apocalyptic literature.[186] The glory days had passed, leaving behind the twilight of a lesser institution. Gunkel deemed the author of the book of Daniel, notwithstanding his creativity, hardly a proper prophet, a mere "epigone" beneath the greater ones of old.[187] Zechariah, too, represented, for Gunkel, a decline in prophecy: unlike the older prophets, he required much more elucidation to understand.[188] Despite the polemic against his predecessors for their fixation on documents and authors, Gunkel himself succumbed to the fascination with inspired artists working at the end of a longer, murkier tradition. Uniting a general interest in individuals with one in the Christian kind especially, he stressed the need to establish the distinctive contributions of his ancient authors. In fact, Gunkel even set "the task of historical exegesis" as "doing justice to the original intention of the writer."[189] One aspect of this inquiry involved distinguishing between allegories created by the authors themselves and material already in circulation but subsequently allegorized by an author – a distinction he then correlated to one of thought and image, respectively.[190] Further still, though Gunkel strongly resisted what he himself considered a specifically Protestant penchant for deriving from the Old Testament everything found in Revelation, he could not help but gravitate toward the interiority of inspired ancient personalities. Much the same as he enlarged the data set beyond the confines of the canon, he broadened the investigation to the world outside the text, into that of internal experience. He reckoned early Christianity and even Judaism as "vibrant religions with independent religious wants" and described a reading of literature aimed

[185] See ibid., esp. 193, 200–01, 253–55, 282, cf. 343, 347, 397.
[186] Ibid., 254.
[187] See ibid., esp. 334–35, cf. 269 n. 1.
[188] Ibid., 122–23, cf. also 11.
[189] Cf. ibid., 231, 287–88, 324 n. 5.
[190] Ibid., 73–74, cf. 101, 129, 180, 329–32, 341–42, 346 n. 2, 356.

at accessing the personal dimensions of its production: "Precisely the vital, the historically operative, i. e., the meaningful in them – as much as it may have been nurtured or at least influenced by the reading of 'scripture' – never had its final reason in a book but rather the persons, their experiences and encounters, and in the history in which they are grounded."[191] This attempt to turn historical study outward from the canon and inward to the author bore no small consequences for his interpretation insofar as he pressed analysis ever further into the realm of psychology.[192]

With this investigation and its complex of moving parts, Gunkel knew full well he was confronting academia's *ancien régime*. He began the book with a punch. On the foreword's second page, this scholar of the past foresaw the future: an imminent critique from his detractors. "I deem it methodologically objectionable," he proclaimed, "to investigate only the origins of things and to ignore their further, often more important and more valuable history."[193] This premise supplied him justification to pursue the impact of Mesopotamia on Israel and beyond. Accordingly, a proper study of the Old Testament required a deeper inquiry on either side of the canon. No longer could scholars of the Bible limit themselves to that literature alone, nor could historians of the ancient world neglect its exchange with the biblical one. Expecting almost certain disapproval from adherents to the dominant (or domineering) source criticism, Gunkel also adduced their own attempts at reconstruction to warrant those of his own. He conceptualized the history of religion as an enterprise on par with philology: the study of texts in general and the history of texts in particular. So he added, "In fact, if only the history of religion's method is applied with scientific rigor, with caution and expertise, then I see no reason why results in this field could not be achieved [that are] equally certain as in that [field] of philology."[194] Not only did Gunkel envision the history of religion as an investigation into a particular kind of human phenomena, but he could also speak of it as a discreet academic discipline with distinct methods of its own. Like theology, philology, or history, the history of religion could thus invoke, depending on the context, an object of study, a mode of analysis, or a field of knowledge.

The would-be revolutionary did not cease with a mere anticipation of assaults from his opponents; he went outright on the offensive. In one chapter of the vol-

[191] Ibid., 238, cf. 229, 237.

[192] Ibid., 255, 252, cf. also 238, 216, 287.

[193] Ibid., vi. He continued, "Therefore, I have not contented myself to assert the Babylonian origin of biblical material but to argue everywhere besides in what distinctive way the adopted material was grasped and reshaped in Israel" (ibid.).

[194] Ibid. Imprecisely, the English rendering turns this statement into a comparative, in favor of Gunkel's method: "Furthermore, if the religio-historical method is applied with scholarly rigor, caution, and professionalism, then I can see no reason why, in this field, results cannot be obtained which are even more certain than those obtained through philology" (idem, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton*, xl).

ume, Gunkel censured the standard emphasis on "contemporaneous exegesis," i. e., interpretation focused solely on a text's most immediate context. Associating such a venture with source criticism, Gunkel deemed it appropriate only with material either entirely composed or slightly reworked by a single author.[195] For texts characterized by other, more complex histories – which constituted no small share within the Hebrew Bible – he championed a new approach. This method – styled tradition history ("*traditionsgeschichtliche" Methode*) – ought to grant attention to transmission history (*Überlieferungsgeschichte*), he argued.[196] Gunkel found source criticism too synchronic in nature – a counterintuitive critique, perhaps, given its devotion to determining the composition history of texts. Trained for research in both Testaments, he perceived clear parallels in the limitation of such analysis across the canon: scholarship had yielded "supremely complicated investigations" for the so-called synoptic problem of the gospels and for the source analysis of Genesis but delivered "merely rudiments (*Ansätze*) for a history of the early Christian tradition of Jesus and still no history of the formation and transmission of the patriarchal legends," just as it had generated an "abundance of source hypotheses in Revelation yet no history of the apocalyptic tradition."[197] This state of affairs, together with a series of other convictions detailed within his treatise, led Gunkel to believe a revision of methodology was in order for biblical research.[198] Furthermore, while he expressed appreciation for the historicizing impulse that had finally prevailed in biblical scholarship, Gunkel nonetheless averred contemporaneous exegesis was, in fact, "the final repercussion of churchly allegorical interpretation"; by no means intended as a compliment, this unflattering parentage allegedly explained the venture's biases and, ultimately, its inadequacy for true historical science.[199] Otherwise an ally, even England's Cheyne faulted Gunkel for his overconfidence in a single research method, not to mention "a superabundant amount of controversy" in his promotion of it.[200] Indeed, he did himself few favors with his tone.

Crucially, Gunkel considered his tome thoroughly theological in nature. The author reported on his collaboration with the cuneiformist Zimmern, belaboring the process of analysis that went into the volume: "the theologian recognized – through inner-theological observations – the foreign character of a material, postulated its Babylonian origins on more general grounds, sought to reconstruct its original form, and then submitted the results to the assyriologist for confirma-

[195] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 202–35; he distinguished three forms of inquiry encompassed by this term: 205–07. Machinist helpfully suggested "contemporaneous" for *zeitgeschichtlich* (see Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton*, 287 n. 41).

[196] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 207–09, cf. also 3.

[197] Ibid., 209.

[198] Ibid., 212, 215–16, 233.

[199] Ibid., 234.

[200] Cheyne, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Gunkel, 256, cf. 260.

tion."[201] The sequence was essential. Gunkel portrayed his study as unbiased and objective, written neither for nor against a party – be it churchly or scholarly – and based on findings less purposively obtained than quite simply observed.[202] In addition, he assigned to the discipline of theology a claim on specific fields of study. Staking out the academic turf, Gunkel pretended to such a prerogative with respect to the Hebrew Bible and its relationship to the ancient Near East. Amidst destabilized assertions about the historical credibility and uniqueness of the Bible, between academic disputes that – frequently sensationalized – caused a fracas in the public square, and among widespread, festering crises of faith, this licentiate of theology exhorted, "The theologian's thankfulness to the assyriologists would no doubt still be greater if the assyriologist consistently followed the practice of presenting [his] suppositions related to the O[ld] T[estament] – that is, outside his own special field of scholarship – first to the experts and only then to the larger public."[203] Just as Gunkel reserved the final say on Genesis for specialists in the Old Testament, so he retained interpretive rights of Revelation for those in the New as well. Gunkel reproached the classicist Dieterich not only for interpreting – and reconstructing – the story of the woman, the child, and the dragon according to the Greek myth of Apollo and for neglecting the potential impact of tradition in explaining the state of the text but also for approaching the material itself with insufficient "respect."[204] In sum, Gunkel showed an openness to other sets of data, tools of analysis, and areas of knowledge – established and emergent alike – but only inasmuch as his could still hold pride of place.

With *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, Gunkel completed his map for the field of inquiry he deemed so vital to explore and charted the analytical pathways he felt best to do so. This historian of religion in antiquity developed the plan as he undertook that rather precarious expedition of an academic career, his own proving to be especially challenging given the particular institutional, professional, and personal obstacles standing in the way. He set out on the journey as an aspiring New Testament scholar but passed from formative Christianity through early Judaism to ancient Israel and beyond – all these areas, and others, traversed in this major work. Even before he moved to the field of Old Testament beneath the lindens of Berlin, the characteristic features of his historiography were in place. Gunkel wanted to lengthen the period of time, broaden the sources of relevance, and deepen the interpretation of experience. Extant texts gave witness to much longer, disparate traditions transmitted and at certain points adapted by individual authors, who could avail themselves of the basic tradition to articulate their own thoughts and feelings. Without denying the value of source criticism, predominant as it was in biblical scholarship, he

[201] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, vii–viii.
[202] Ibid., vii.
[203] Ibid., 30 n. 1, cf. also 3, 18 n. 1, 385; see, too, Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 19–20.
[204] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 275–76 n. 1, cf. also ibid., 286 n. 1.

considered this kind of excursion into the ancient world only a first step. For this reason, he believed the venture, so important to his forebears, had "only so much value as it contributes to historical understanding of the respective writing and therefore promotes in its domain the true task of all biblical research, namely, the knowledge of religious history."[205] The past worth knowing, for Gunkel, was the religious one.

The investigation of this chapter – admittedly long and detailed – into both the training and the work of Hermann Gunkel before his re-centering on the Old Testament has pursued three separate aims: first, to situate his research on the Hebrew Bible along the broader trajectory of his academic career; second, to demonstrate how a complex of questions, assumptions, and operations all animated his scholarship regardless of any specific data set and thereby argue a theoretical apparatus preceded and in fact underwrote his methods of historiography; and, third, to suggest in the process how the objectives and the practices of the human sciences in general and historical ones in particular were shifting at the *fin de siècle*. Though treated by his few biographers, these earliest texts by Gunkel have gone mostly unscrutinized by his interpreters. Both his first disquisition, on conceptions of the spirit in Christianity and Judaism, and his reviews of others', concerning Jewish literature, suggested the priorities in principle and practice that he consolidated in his work on ancient myth. These priorities eventually distinguished not only Gunkel's own work on the Hebrew Bible but also new directions in the historiography of the ancient world more broadly.

While Gunkel gradually retreated from the New Testament to the Old by way of Judaism, the theories and the methods of his scholarship remained consistent all the while. What won him fame in the end was there already at the start. As with those of Wellhausen, Gunkel's contributions to the history of ancient texts and traditions less arose empirically from than descended analytically upon his data. In his study of the spirit, he granted prominence to questions of origin and diffusion, to matters of experience even in the realm of the irrational, and to issues of individuality in the person of Paul. His labors in 2 Esdras emphasized the need for an empathetic exegesis with especial attention to the originality of an author, stressed the distinction between genres of literature, and showed an interest in ushering the results of academia to a wider public. With his monograph on a circulating myth, Gunkel differentiated form and content as levels of analysis, explored how literary artifacts might represent only a moment in the life of a much wider and longer tradition, pursued the actual means of transmission even outside of texts, and focused on the distinctiveness not only of Israel or Christianity but also of personages. This series of concerns in writing on the ancient past would surface time and again in Gunkel's subsequent research, once

[205] Ibid., 210 n. 2, cf. also 233.

he turned towards the Pentateuch, Psalms, and prophets. With religion as his object, the historian hoped to recover the experiences of inspired individuals.

A last priority, however, merits some remark. Just like the analysis of Gunkel's larger corpus can provide a deeper insight into not only his historiography as a whole but also its constituent parts, especially that of Israel, so too the evaluation of his interpretive program within the wider context of publication in general and of the marketplace in particular reveals prime concerns of his. Gunkel actively sought to expand his audience and hence to popularize.[206] Over the course of thirty years, from 1892 through 1922, he published articles in *Die Christliche Welt*, the flagship organ of cultural Protestantism, along with church papers like *Kirchliche Gegenwart* and *Deutsch-Evangelisch. Monatsblätter für den gesamten deutschen Protestantismus*. In the same way, Gunkel printed his writings in magazines for culture and politics, venues such as *Preußische Jahrbücher*, *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik*, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung für Kritik der Internationalen Wissenschaft*, and *Theologische Literaturzeitung* as well as daily papers, including *Frankfurter Zeitung, Deutsche Rundschau*, and *Tägliche Rundschau*.[207] Many interpretations of the psalms that Gunkel offered featured first in these publications. Moreover, rather than merely write as one academic to others, he founded and/or expanded several series designed to reach a greater public – more specifically, the educated middle classes. They included "Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," "Die Schriften des Alten Testaments," and "Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher für die deutsche christliche Gegenwart."

This dissemination was both an end and means. Gunkel wanted to propagate his findings for three specific reasons: financial gain, academic impact, and theological conviction.[208] Indeed, the audience and aim remain essential to consider. When he wrote and published, this historian of the biblical world frequently sought to communicate not with the *ordinarius* but the ordinary person. Thus, Gunkel began a substantial book on Genesis – and with it an entire series of monographs – with an homage to holy scripture:

> Bible, wonderful Bible, Teacher of humanity, Bedrock of our spiritual being! You are like that glorified city divine upon the towering world mountain, which lies near the heavens! The nations behold you and drink from the living water of your streams! Entire generations

[206] On this aspect of his undertakings, see, specifically, Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 259–67; Nittert Janssen, *Theologie fürs Volk. Der Einfluß der Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule auf die Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Studien und Texte zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule 4; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999); idem, "Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung. Breitenwirkung durch Vorträge und 'gemeinverständliche' Veröffentlichungen," in *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen*, ed. Lüdemann and Schröder, 109–36; more generally, see Conrad, *Lexikonpolitik*; cf. also Wolfes, *Protestantische Theologie und Moderne Welt*, 29–71.

[207] See Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 100–01, 151, cf. 394–99.

[208] Cf. Kurtz, "Waiting at Nemi," 581–84.

may turn away from you and disdain you because they do not know you; time and again humanity comes back to you.[209]

Gunkel would surely be surprised – not improbably, even outraged – to witness an isolation of his interpretive methods from the abiding Christian faith that did so much to forge them. Science meant, for him, their union, not their separation. Gunkel wanted not only to take the Bible to the people but also to catapult religion to the very center of biblical scholarship. As early as 1900, he appealed, in *Die Christliche Welt*, to scholars of many specialities to focus on a single theme:

> Dear God, if only I had a voice that would penetrate the hearts and consciences of the researchers in theology, then I would exclaim day and night nothing other than this: Do not forget your holy duty to your people! Write for the educated! Do not speak so much of literary criticism, textual criticism, archaeology, and all other scholarly things, but speak of religion! Think of the essential! Our people thirst for your words on religion and its history![210]

This prescribed concentration on religion was not solely for the sake of greater knowledge on the past. For all of his concern with tradition, transmission, and text, with language, life, and literature, Gunkel's complex exploration of the ancient world was very much about the Christian present. In this way, his work on the history of religion was more than philology, theology, or history alone.

[209] Hermann Gunkel, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen (Das erste Buch Mosis)* (Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, in Auswahl neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt 1/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), v.

[210] Gunkel, "Ein Notschrei aus Anlaß des Buches. Himmelsbild und Weltanschauung im Wandel der Zeiten," 60. Over a decade later, he praised the progress of popularization, in an article celebrating a holiday course that had brought together professional theologians, ecclesiastical officials, and interested laity: see Hermann Gunkel, "Über die Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung," in *Festschrift zum 25jährigen Bestehen der Ferienkurse in Jena* (Jena: Diederichs, 1913), 70–80.

Chapter Six

History, Not Past: The Religion of *Religionsgeschichte*

Hermann Gunkel would be horrified to see what has become of his program. Indeed, the man expended excessive amounts of energy in decrying what he saw as stagnation in biblical scholarship. "The School [of Wellhausen], especially with its newest representatives," he reported in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, "has buried itself more and more in an initially essential and salutary but now increasingly fruitless source criticism."[1] Already by 1895, he considered these efforts but "groundwork." Six years later, that list of such preparatory labors expanded to include textual criticism, grammatical observations, archaeological endeavors, and the like.[2] As imperative as it may be, he felt, this approach to biblical literature had long since passed its prime. The corpse of his predecessor and former professor Stade had barely grown cold in the ground when Gunkel cheerfully announced – in a somewhat ambivalent accolade – "Scholarship nourishes itself from the lifeblood of scholars and yet proceeds to step over her figures (*und schreitet doch über ihre Personen hinweg*)."[3] In his own estimation, now a new generation needed to regenerate that degenerated body of biblical research: one long atrophied through skepticism, stubbornness, and self-satisfaction to boot.

If Gunkel felt his predecessors had lost themselves in spadework, he would likely think his own successors have done the very same. Habitually, perhaps inevitably, the disciples have since atomized the master's operation. Acolytes Emil Balla (1885–1956), Sigmund Mowinckel (1884–1965), and Greßmann in Old Testament alongside Martin Dibelius (1883–1947), Karl Ludwig Schmidt (1891–1956), and Rudolf Bultmann (1884–1976) in the New all advanced his

[1] Hermann Gunkel, "Wellhausen, Julius, und Wellhausensche Schule," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung*, Vol. 5, *Roh–Zypressen*, 1st ed., ed. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1913), 1888–89; no longer indirect, the statement was more pointed in the volume's second edition, once Wellhausen had died (cf. Hermann Gunkel, "Wellhausen, Julius [1844–1918]," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 5, *S–Z*, 2nd ed., ed. Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack [Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1931], 1820–22).

[2] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, esp. 209–10 n. 3. He referred to the times as "our source-critical age" (ibid., 135, cf. 96, 200, 209); cf. idem, *Genesis*, 1st ed., foreword, not reprinted in the third edition.

[3] Gunkel, "Bernhard Stade," in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 9.

study of literary forms in transmitted texts.[4] From prophetic literature through especially the psalms, studies in this vein have aimed to regain the structure of ancient words and track their changes in time.[5] Much of this work refined a sense of genre in the text, classifying types of literature preserved within the Bible.

A flood of such research resurged in the 1960s and early 1970s, which may have reflected the fragmentation of knowledge, the evasion of totalities, and the interest in structures rather typical of the postwar period.[6] From no less a platform than the Presidential Address of the Society of Biblical Literature, Muilenburg hoped to revitalize the venture so oft identified with Gunkel, albeit not without some necessary change.[7] Subsequent waves, or ripples, in the vogues of biblical scholarship have continued to debate the potential for rehabilitating the study of form in concrete settings.[8] Concerned with matters of method, scholars of Hebrew Bible still wrangle over terms and the thoughts behind them, with the gap between "form" (sc., individual shape or structure) and "genre" (i. e., general pattern or type), for instance, attracting much attention. Furthermore, while some would hope to update the expedition of "form criticism," others have called into question the value of the very enterprise.[9] Non-germanophone writings, whether specialist or not, ofttimes also feature words like *Gattungsgeschichte*, *Formgeschichte, Traditionsgeschichte, Überlieferungsgeschichte,* or *Sitz im Leben*

[4] Anthony F. Campbell offers a nice survey of his legacy: idem, "Form Criticism's Future," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 15–31.

[5] Cf., e. g., Robert R. Wilson, "Prophecy and Ecstasy: A Reexamination," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98, no. 3 (1979): 321–37 [repr. in *Community, Identity, and Ideology: Social Science Approaches to the Hebrew Bible,* ed. Charles Carter and Carol Meyers (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 6; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 404–22].

[6] Cf., e. g., Klaus Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese*, 1st ed. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), 5th ed. as *Was ist Formgeschichte? Methoden der Bibelexegese* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), a subtitle change that came with the third edition [ET: *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method*, trans., from the second edition, S. M. Cupitt (Scribner Studies in Biblical Interpretation; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969)]; Gene M. Tucker, *Form Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971); John H. Hayes, ed., *Old Testament Form Criticism* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974).

[7] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond." On the subsequent shift to rhetoric, see Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994).

[8] Cf., e. g., Eisen and Gerstenberger, ed., *Hermann Gunkel revisited*; Sweeney and Ben Zvi, ed., *The Changing Face of Form Criticism.*

[9] See esp. Erhard Blum, "*Formgeschichte* – A Misleading Category? Some Critical Remarks," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism*, ed. Sweeney and Ben Zvi, 32–45 [GO: "'Formgeschichte' – ein irreführender Begriff?," in *Lesarten der Bibel. Untersuchungen zu einer Theorie der Exegese des Alten Testaments*, ed. Erhard Blum and Helmut Utzschneider (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006), 85–96 [repr., without the title being a question, in Blum, *Grundfragen der historischen Exegese. Methodologische, philologische und hermeneutische Beiträge zum Alten Testament*, ed. Wolfgang Oswald and Kristin Weingart (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 1/95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 69–82].

as a *terminus technicus* – a trend, first, largely inconsistent with more common treatment of the translated "source criticism" (*Quellenkritik*, *Literarkritik*) and, second, incongruent with the nature of Gunkel's own interpretive ambitions, which sought to remove those white gloves from a scientific philology and stain its hands with the earth and blood of lived experience. He himself would have deemed neither term nor concept beyond the power of translation, a point perhaps best underscored by his commitment to cultural impact and the public realm. Indeed, he would have readily affirmed, "We murder to dissect."[10]

For all the care and deftness on display in their extension and transplant of the different branches in Gunkel's program, biblical scholars often disregard the roots that gave them life. Innocuously enough, Gunkel first considered "the true task of all biblical investigations" to be "insight (*Erkenntnis*) into the history of religion"; however, in a programmatic essay, written several years thereafter, he pronounced the undertaking an explicitly theological venture, one meant not to recover ancient dogma but to access piety – or "the religious life" – of yore.[11] "Thus, the vital person, in his thought and desire, in the great diversity of his entire spiritual being," Gunkel prescribed, "this is the true object (*Gegenstand*) of all exegesis."[12] As a result, meditation on the aesthetic qualities of a text, he held, brought with it the perception of various genres, which could then lead to their sequencing for a history of literature that, in turn, could reveal a history of religion. This latter history, he hoped, would breathe new life into ancient Israel's greatest authors.[13] Reflection on literary form therefore offered access to its religious contents.

If the integral cohesion among and close coordination between the distinct interpretive tasks specified by Gunkel have frequently escaped the notice of his successors, the theoretical framework that composed and underwrote them usually disappears in the secondary literature as well. Be it his idea of culture (dependent as it was on belief in the primitive), his theory of the mind (with its notion of psychic unity), or his sense of historical laws (which set the understanding of literature's growth in time), many fundamental elements of his interpretation might well find quick dismissal today. Likewise, his methodological insistence on intuition and almost unrestrained empathetic hermeneutic – that is, identification with authors long since dead – would find a tortuous, if not treacherous,

---

[10] William Wordsworth, "The Tables Turned; An Evening Scene, *on the same subject*," in idem and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Lyrical Ballads: 1798 and 1802*, ed. Fiona Stafford (Oxford World's Classics; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 118–19.

[11] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 209–10 n. 1; Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 24–25. The essay first appeared as "Ziele und Methoden der alttestamentlichen Exegese," in *Monatsschrift für die kirchliche Praxis* 4 /*Zeitschrift für praktische Theologie* 26 (1904): 521–40, with a Greek epigraph that blended the Septuagint's Ps 68:10 (Masoretic text Ps 69:10) and John 2:17: *because zeal for your house will consume me*.

[12] Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 13.

[13] Ibid., 23–24.

path to any scholarly consensus in the present. In fact, Gunkel believed the true student of religion must be herself religious, an epistemological position perhaps represented but by no means orthodox these days.[14] As he did with "history," Gunkel conceptualized the interpretive enterprise as an integrated whole. Precisely whether, which, or how many parts of his program can operate on their own if removed from the larger ensemble or, conversely, whether that program itself can still function if certain parts no longer prove tenable remain questions for his intellectual heirs, especially those with an epistemological bent, to answer.[15]

Building on the indispensable efforts of Martin Buss, this chapter seeks to rebuild the whole of Gunkel's interpretive project, to show the road he had constructed as he sought to reach the past.[16] History, for Gunkel, did not end in olden days. He targeted the past for the sake of the present. As he wrote at the turn of the century, "Our people thirst for your words about *religion* and its *history*! Do not be so timid and do not believe that you must conceal from the laity what you have discerned! How do you expect to have trust when you avoid the ultimate question? Now there is still time. Soon it will be too late. But if you keep silent, then the blatherers will speak."[17] Plagued with a keen sense of crisis in the modern world, he hoped inspired ancient authors might speak to the present age. Indeed, this ambition ultimately drove his multiplex, highly-coordinated project not only to its end but also in its urgency.

As argued in the preceding chapter, the fundamental elements so characteristic of Gunkel's work on the Hebrew Bible were, in fact, already manifest in his earlier inquiries into formative Christianity and early Judaism. But he refined those principles and continued to expand them to other sets of data through the course of his career. This examination disassembles Gunkel's program into its different components to demonstrate how they fit together, to expose their underlying logic, and to uncover the ultimate aim of his interpretation. First, this chapter reverses the actual sequence of Gunkel's interpretive operations. Whereas his methodological procedure essentially went backwards – from literary compositions in their complex extant form to their pre-literary origins in specific social

[14] Cf. ibid., 15–17.

[15] F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp arrives at the conclusion, "While no part of Gunkel's program may be taken at face value – indeed, the paradigm as a whole is probably no longer salvageable, and not a few of its aspects were outdated even at their first articulation[–]still his strong awareness of an informing orality that has shaped many aspects of biblical literature, when rethought beyond its highly Romantic conceptualizations, remains a vital and enduring insight" (idem, *On Biblical Poetry* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2015], 235).

[16] Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, esp. 209–62.

[17] Gunkel, "Ein Notschrei aus Anlaß des Buches. Himmelsbild und Weltanschauung im Wandel der Zeiten," 60; see also Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, "Rettung der Persönlichkeit. Protestantische Theologie als Kulturwissenschaft des Christentums," in *Kultur und Kulturwissenschaften um 1900*, [Vol. 1,] *Krise der Moderne und Glaube an die Wissenschaft*, ed. idem, Rüdiger vom Bruch, and Gangolf Hübinger (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1989), 103–31.

settings of particular cultural groups – the analysis here shows how he envisioned the process unfolding forwards, chronologically. Secondly, this chapter seeks to articulate the epistemological warrants for the many comparisons he drew. Gunkel belonged to a generation of scholars who increasingly devoted their attention to like phenomena beyond the boundaries of language, culture, time, and place. His justification for juxtaposition, however, went often unexplained. Moreover, the rationale itself could differ depending on the data sets he collocated. The comparative enterprise as undertaken by Gunkel hence deserves a greater scrutiny, for an inner logic did indeed underpin the venture. Third, this chapter considers the ultimate aims set forth by Gunkel for the interpretation of biblical texts. In the end, he conceptualized the study of the Bible – for specialists and laity alike – as a kind of supratextual pilgrimage, an essay by modern interpreters to identify with the experience of ancient authors. Gunkel sought to recover these moments of such inspired personalities of old for the sake of the present: a time, he felt, desperately in need of religious renewal. Devotion to antiquity thus became very much about modernity.

6.1 Form in Text Through Time

In his brilliant "The Rules of the Game," Momigliano avers, "the historian is not an interpreter of sources, even in the very act of interpreting them. He is, rather, an interpreter of that reality of which his sources are telling signs or fragments."[18] For Gunkel, that ultimate reality was religious inspiration. Not the dry, brittle bones of textual remains but the spiritual life that once had animated them seized his imagination. This historian lived his life trying to grasp that very spirit. Indeed, he roved from Genesis to Esdras and from prophets to the psalms in his quest for lived religion. To do so, he elaborated fundamental principles first set forth systematically in *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* and developed further in the course of his career. Yet rather than begin where Gunkel did and hence recede from objectification in a text to the subjectivity of *Geist*, the exploration here will proceed from the chronological sequence he imagined in his work, showing how the historian of antiquity believed his material had transformed over time into its extant form.

The interpretive framework started with a substance. Be it a genre, a story, or some experience, he believed in real – still recoverable – historical prototypes, which betrayed perhaps a typically Protestant and romantic fixation on origins.

[18] Arnaldo Momigliano, "The Rules of the Game in the Study of Ancient History," trans. Kenneth W. Yu, *History and Theory* 55 (2016) [1975]: 39–45, at 45. He concludes, "What ultimately makes a historian is the ability to read the document as if it were not a document, but an actual event of past life" (ibid.).

Now, the specific sort of that material could differ. Gunkel sought the myth of creation wrought from a cosmic conflict waged between chaos and a god, which he found in the Middle East.[19] He also followed branches of belief in resurrection after death and saw its roots in the basic human longing for imperishable existence.[20] In the same way, Gunkel surveyed a complex of historical, etiological, ethnological, etymological, ceremonial, and even geological foundations in the various legends of Genesis – and in doing so identified "historical memories," too.[21] As yet another instance, he located in exclamations like "hallelujah" "the most ancient form" and "a primordial cell" of poetry.[22] Likewise, he deduced, "The core experience of all prophecy is 'ecstasy.'"[23] Nothing came from nowhere. He therefore hoped to pinpoint a proteus and trace its manifestations however, whenever, and wherever they appeared. The general study of one isolatable item hence became a history of substance or, more literally, stuff history (*Stoffgeschichte*).[24]

Said substance rose, however, only within parameters. Gunkel studied those factors which determined initial production of the material in question. Ultimately, these delimiters demonstrated certain sociological as well as anthropological assumptions of his own – sometimes latent, other times quite consid-

---

[19] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*.

[20] Gunkel, "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament," 418.

[21] See Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., vii–c, esp. xx–xxvi; for Gunkel's comments on memory, cf. ibid., vii, ix–x, xviii, lix, lxxxix, 50, 52, 76, 290, 411. Although Biddle provides an adequate, if wooden, translation of the third edition, I render – and therefore cite – the German for more consistent nuance.

[22] Gunkel, "Halleluja," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung*, Vol. 2, *Deutschmann–Hessen*, 1st ed., ed. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1910), 1816–17; cf. idem, "Psalmen," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung*, Vol. 4, *Maaßen–Rogge*, 1st ed., ed. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1913), 1927–49, at 1932–33.

[23] Gunkel, "Einleitungen" (i. e., "Geschichte Vorderasiens zur Zeit der großen Propheten," "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten," "Die Propheten als Schriftsteller und Dichter"), in Hans Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, 1st ed. (Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, in Auswahl neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt 2/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915), xi–lxxii, at xxi; cf. also his earlier ruminations in idem, "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten Israels. Eine religionspsychologische Studie," *Das Suchen der Zeit. Blätter deutscher Zukunft* 1 (1903): 112–53. For a bibliographic overview of Gunkel's work on prophets, see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 238–39.

[24] Gunkel used the term explicitly in at least "Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie. Ein Vortrag," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 42, no. 1 (1924): 177–208, at 185; cf. also, inter alia, idem, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen," 601–11; idem, *Elias, Jahve und Baal* (Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher 2/8; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1906), 6–7; idem, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, e. g., 79, 143, 255–56, 330, 344, 347, 350. As Gunkel turned more towards the relationship between content and form, the inquiry transitioned to a history of genre: cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 56 n. 12; see further Henning Paulsen, "Traditionsgeschichtliche Methode und religionsgeschichtliche Schule," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 75 (1978): 20–55.

ered – which emerged across his explorations of religion and literature alike. In consequence, these concrete parameters of antiquity restricted, if not dictated, production of that ancient material from the start. The sequence proved significant for his threefold sense of genre, which, he argued, comprised setting, subject, and structure. In perhaps the most developed declaration, Gunkel affirmed, "specific thoughts are expressed in specific form on a specific occasion."[25] Whereas the structure was subject to its subject matter, the setting mattered to that subject matter, too. On the horizon of this thinking lay his concern with causation much more than a mere correlation. He did see some intrinsic interconnection in form and content – which, he contended, "belong intimately together, for form is the necessary expression of content"; however, Gunkel finally stopped short of untangling their particular relationship as well as that between initial thought and subsequent expression.[26] Through a meticulous analysis of the intellectual underpinnings to his interpretation of genre, Buss has apprehended, "Gunkel appears to have believed that in traditional oral life, only one kind of thing can be said in only one way on any given occasion so that genres appear in a 'pure manner.'"[27] At base lay a particular perception of the primitive, an anthropological framework already present early on in Gunkel's corpus yet more fully manifest later on, perhaps most of all in his affirmative references to Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie* and Edward Burnett Tylor's (1832–1917) translated *Primitive Culture*.[28] Proceeding from this interpretive structure, Gunkel maintained a smaller capacity of cognition together with the tighter hold of custom – both allegedly present among primitives – could account for the shorter length, the simpler thought, and the lesser individualism of ancient literary compositions. A primal substance fit with a primeval people. Yet Gunkel believed modern genres belonged to specific

[25] Gunkel, "Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie," 183. On the intertwining of these elements, see Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, esp. 247–51; cf. Kurtz, "Axes of Inquiry," 279–84.

[26] Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 23.

[27] Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 251. Elsewhere, Buss has clarified, "The concept of a life-situation refers not to a historical occasion, but to a structural element in a society (an 'institution'). In this respect, Gunkel's approach parallels a widespread interest since about the year 1900 in structure or function rather than in history" (idem, *The Prophetic Word of Hosea: A Morphological Study* [Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 111; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969], 1).

[28] Gunkel cited Tylor, for instance, in his *Genesis*, 3rd ed., 106, 213, 221, 317, 319–20, which he inserted for the third edition; in idem, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, 4th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917), 224, which he added between the third and fourth editions for his explanation of Ps 29; and in idem, *Das Märchen im Alten Testament*, 1st ed. (Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher 2/23,26; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1917), 110. Wundt he cited, e. g., in idem, *Genesis* (first in the 3rd ed.), xxvi, lxxviii; idem, *Das Märchen im Alten Testament*, 7–8, 52, 99, 107, 121, 124. On Gunkel's sense of the primitive, see Patricia G. Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 62; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988); Sean M. Warner, "Primitive Saga Men," *Vetus Testamentum* 29, no. 3 (1979): 325–335.

settings, too.[29] He therefore stressed embeddedness, what he called the setting in life (*Sitz im Leben*).[30]

An original substance could spread across space and time alike. Gunkel showed keen interest in the study of diffusion. Rather than emerge in parallel, certain like phenomena actually betrayed a genetic relationship, thus betraying an historical connection of dependency. This explanation was one of monogenesis. Accordingly, he declared, "A part of these legends and certainly a great many were not conceived in Israel but migrated from foreign lands into Israel. This, too, lies in the nature of these stories (*Geschichten*), that they move from people to people, from land to land, and also from religion to religion."[31] Such an interest in diffusion diffused across his corpus, no matter the language, land, or literature in view. For example, Gunkel reckoned stories of the patriarchs had come, in fact, from Babylonia.[32] Through the same sort of inquiry into derivation and dissemination, he alluded to the symbol of a winged sun-disc traveling from Egypt to Persia by way of Syria-Palestine then Assyria.[33] An earlier exemplar of his interest in homology instead of analogy (i. e., in phenomena descendent from a common ancestor), *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* pursued the genealogy of a mythos and traced how this one mythological tea was steeped in the waters of space and time. Indeed, Gunkel had a taste for aged religion. And he liked to have it strong.

In the complex process of an ancient reception that oft respected neither time nor space, Gunkel saw the possibility of multidimensional transformations. These changes, he maintained, had been occasioned and impacted by gradual shifts in genre, generation, and geography as well as language, setting, and culture. Though Gunkel saw so much similarity across any number of distinguishable boundaries, he ultimately had to account for change and difference over time, in spite (or precisely because) of his proposed unity or integrity of an essence and its multiple manifestations. For this reason, he could insist upon a transformation of the Mesopotamian cosmogony in Syria-Palestine.[34] (Early Israelite markers included, inter alia, a "strong subjectivity, indeed a flaming

[29] Cf. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 245, 251; Eric Voegelin, *Order and History*, Vol. 1, *Israel and Revelation*, ed. Maurice P. Hogan (The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin 14; Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001), 334.

[30] On historical development of this concept, see Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 234–44.

[31] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., lvi, but cf. xxx.

[32] Hermann Gunkel, *Israel und Babylonien. Der Einfluss Babyloniens auf die israelitische Religion* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 25 [ET: *Israel and Babylon: The Influence of Babylon on the Religion of Israel* (*A Reply to Delitzsch*), trans. E. S. B. (Philadelphia: McVey, 1904)]; idem, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen*, 118–19.

[33] Gunkel, "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament," 409.

[34] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., esp. 129–30.

passion" and, later, a certain "naïveté."[35]) But he argued mutations could and did materialize even within a single culture. Gunkel posited, accordingly,

> When a new generation has arisen, when external circumstance has changed, or when human thought has shifted – whether religion, moral ideals, or aesthetic taste – so also popular (*volkstümlich*) legend cannot remain the same at last. Slowly and haltingly, always at a certain distance, legends follow the general changes, some more, others less. Thus, the legends offer us an extremely important material for recognizing the changes in the people; an entire history of the religious, moral, and aesthetic judgments of ancient Israel can be written from Genesis.[36]

As he conceptualized the movements of a material, Gunkel postulated other elements might intermingle, too, themselves with their own set of multiplex mutations. In consequence, the different origins of constituent materials within an extant complex, now joined together, could require separate studies to trace their own distinctive histories as well. The historian therefore theorized a stability of substance despite the instabilities brought by the contingencies of space and time.

Ruling the inquiry into prehistory "an interesting, important, and truly theological problem," he hoped to unravel tapestries into their individual threads that reached far into the past.[37] Gunkel allowed for different degrees of consciousness or intentionality in adaptation, arguing analysis of the before would yield a better grasp of the after. But he personally preferred that the receiving people be more robust than the material received. "As long as the Israelitic religion was in its vigor," he wrote, "it assimilated actively this foreign material; in later times, when religion had become relaxed in strength, it swallowed foreign elements feather and all."[38] While the first claim mirrored one advanced by classicists, who oft averred the Greeks could integrate foreign elements without debasing the purity of their own national essence, the second paralleled a different one long advanced about the Jews by theologians in particular, describing a syncretistic people of relatively weak national constitution after the destruction of their state, i. e., the loss of political autonomy. (The same line of inquiry led Gunkel to the conclusion Christianity was also syncretistic.) Thus, the subsequent transformation of one original substance corresponded to a history of the tradition (*Traditionsgeschichte*).

---

[35] Hermann Gunkel, "Die Israelitische Literatur," in *Die orientalischen Literaturen, mit Einleitung. Die Anfänge der Literatur und die Literatur der primitiven Völker*, ed. Paul Hinneberg (Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele 1/7; Berlin: Teubner, 1906), 51–102, at 57 [ET: "The Literature of Ancient Israel," trans. Armin Siedlecki, in *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*, ed. Timothy J. Sandoval and Carleen Mandolfo (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 384; London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 26–83], my translation from the German.

[36] Gunkel, *Genesis,* 3rd ed., lxv; cf. also idem, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 49.

[37] Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen," 604.

[38] Gunkel, "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament," 413.

Crucially, Gunkel queried mechanism. His interest in – alongside speculation on – ancient social contexts led him to question matters of process. "Little was written in ancient Israel," he held, "and there were large portions of the people whom no writing whatsoever reached but who nonetheless participated in 'literature,' i. e., in the creation of works of art through speech (*durch das Wort*). As a result, almost all genres existed in oral transmission before they were consigned to writing."[39] In Gunkel's understanding, not only composition but also circulation occurred apart from writing. He hence insisted many a substance had spread in spoken form prior to textualization.[40] This concern with orality became a trademark of his work. Gunkel reasoned, for example, the story of the flood had come to Israel by mouth.[41] Still, he did not deny the importance of textual process. Even in his work on Genesis, famous as it was for exploration of the oral, he argued for literary sources along with supplements subsequently woven together.[42] In this way, he extended the logic of earlier work in biblical criticism: more than merely unweave a textual complex and only study its strands, Gunkel wanted to see exactly where, how, and why those strands themselves may have come to be in a concrete time and place. Inquiry into such means of circulation he called transmission history (*Überlieferungsgeschichte*).[43]

Travel and transformation could lead to an obscuration of the original material, he argued. With transfer across borders cultural, linguistic, and other came distortion in the substance itself. Distinguishing orality and literacy, Gunkel fastened the first to poetry but the second to prose, linked the oral with legend and the written with history, and assigned the spoken to primitive peoples yet the composed to higher cultures. Further, he contended oral transmission engendered more change than the written kind, even if he surely affirmed that texts saw change as well.[44] Israel in particular had sought to expurgate mythological elements from imported material, so Gunkel.[45] He described distortion as "dark-

[39] Gunkel, "Die Israelitische Literatur," 53, my translation [cf. ET: "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 30].

[40] On this dimension of Gunkel's work, see esp. Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*, 23–34; Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch*, 133–85; Nahkola, *Double Narratives in the Old Testament*, 115–61.

[41] E. g., Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 30–31; idem, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., xii, 72–73.

[42] See, e. g., Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., esp. lxxxii–lxxxv.

[43] Admittedly, this differentiation between *Überlieferungsgeschichte* and *Traditionsgeschichte* does run counter to proposals by other scholars, who argue these two terms first represented synonyms and who, furthermore, contend only a certain confusion has led to their subsequent distinction (e. g., Knight, *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel*, 23; Paulsen, "Traditionsgeschichtliche Methode und religionsgeschichtliche Schule"; cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 56 n. 16); nevertheless, a conceptual contrast in Gunkel's own corpus between an object or material (however transforming or transformed), on the one hand, and a process, on the other, does seem discernible.

[44] See esp. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., vii–ix.

[45] See, succinctly, Gunkel, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 44–47.

ening" and hence upheld transmission of tradition as degenerative in nature.[46] Here, the historian of literature operated within a morphological framework. Gunkel conceptualized the "corruption" of an archetype; however, this language did not necessarily suggest a negative valuation but described, instead, a relationship of derivation or secondariness, i. e., a change in original form. The reference to recensions of a single primal myth – reflecting the terminology of textual criticism – betrayed a typological approach attached to the elapse of time.[47] Much of his interpretive program entailed the juxtaposition of manifestations in hopes of evaluating their qualities as well as the cause of variation.

In the historian's own understanding, the degeneration of one specific substance through the course of time and space stood separate from a more general theory of progression in history. As a result, Gunkel could maintain a morphological corruption in the transmission of a tradition and still insist on a cumulative sense of history, on the one hand, and of literary growth, on the other. He envisioned elementary principles regulating the development of human phenomena – rather standard fare at the buffet of German historicism – and announced, accordingly, "Historical exegesis begins from the fundamental conviction that the life of humanity does not proceed according to arbitrariness and coincidence but that eternal orders have governance within it."[48] Conceiving of cultural stages, Gunkel believed aesthetics, religion, and ethics all advanced in the course of time. Universal structures also governed literature.[49] In fact, Gunkel asserted that individualism superseded socialism.[50] Yet inconsistency arose when he argued "primitive" society could somehow yield higher levels of art or abstraction – the tension between an idealist historicism and a wistful romanticism.[51] Although the grand highway of human development may have been onward and upward, not every turn in tradition thus offered a loftier outlook.[52] Gunkel granted Israel a special status in history – commending its collectors for their supremacy in ethics and religion and praising its prophets for transforming foreign importations – but he faulted later Jews for losing touch with their own nature, even asserting

[46] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, esp. 256; cf. also, e. g., idem, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., lxxxvi.

[47] E. g., Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, esp. 113–14, 148–49.

[48] Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 25–26; cf. also idem, "Das Alte Testament im Licht der modernen Forschung," in *Beiträge zur Weiterentwicklung der christlichen Religion*, ed. Adolf Deissmann et al. (Munich: Lehmann, 1905), 40–76, at 63.

[49] On Gunkel's view of literary laws, see Nahkola, *Double Narratives in the Old Testament*, esp. 134–37, 157–61.

[50] Gunkel, "Individualismus 1. Individualismus und Sozialismus im AT," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung*, Vol. 3, *Heßhus–Lytton*, 1st ed., ed. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1912), 493–501.

[51] See further Warner, "Primitive Saga Men"; Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*, 26–29.

[52] Cf., e. g., Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., xxxiv, l, li, lv, lxx, lxxiv, xciv.

they had become another sort of nationality altogether.[53] Yet belief in even some inevitable development, growth, or progress – be it of composition, cognition, or culture – represented a different, if complexly interrelated, anthropological or theological conception over and against the thesis of degenerative transmission. Gunkel himself may have approved of certain changes evident in his literature, but whatever his taste or preference, he conceptualized the corruption of an archetype. The fate of a primal substance was decay, a degeneration of tradition in the process of transmission.

His bond of form and content meant that genre as a shell – like substance as a seed – succumbed to corruption as well. As Buss has demonstrated, Gunkel drew a distinction between (hypothetical, mostly oral) genres and (extant, mainly textual) classes, in spite of often indiscriminate nomenclature: namely, the use of *Gattung* for both.[54] In fact, Gunkel considered the oldest genres largely unalloyed. Approaching an essentialism à la Aristotle – although ostensibly allowing for a dichotomy between productions oriental and occidental – he advocated the existence of only one proper classification for genre. In consequence, he could object to the typologies of genre constructed by other scholars. This conviction of a true or absolute (rather than heuristic or theoretical) relationality among phenomena underwrote his own comparison with classificatory ventures outside the realm of literature, as with that of esteemed Swedish taxonomist Carolus Linnaeus (1707–1778).[55] Whereas genres represented the full, original integration of setting, subject, and structure, classes constituted their subsequent manifestation and concomitant transformation. Unlike genres, classes fused. Consequently, Gunkel included the category "mixed" in his typology of psalms and could therefore claim the (Jewish) writing "P" merged legend and history together.[56]

Now, Gunkel may have imagined form and content intimately tied, but he did leave space between them, never fully articulating how he theorized the level

---

[53] Ibid., lxxxv, cf., e. g., xii; idem, "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament," 413–414; cf. also idem, "Formen der Hymnen," *Theologische Rundschau* 20, no. 10/11 (1917): 265–304, at 300; idem, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 74.

[54] See Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, esp. 244–55. Gunkel used the terms interchangeably at times: see idem, "Jesaia 33," 182; idem, *The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction*, 10, 30, 22 [cf. GO: "Psalmen," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 1st ed., 4:1932, 1943, cf. 1939]. A certain logocentrism – which often assumes an entirely consistent, fully disciplined use of languages and thus imposes a distorted expectation on concepts or their manifestation in texts – has likely caused some of the confusion among Gunkel's interpreters.

[55] See the critical edition of Gunkel's article on the psalms for *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*: idem, *The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction*, 5, although the reference disappeared between the first and second editions; cf. also idem, completed by Joachim Begrich, *Einleitung in die Psalmen. Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels*, 4th ed., with an index by Walter Beyerlin (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), esp. 10, whose first edition appeared in the series Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 2, Supplement Volume (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933) [ET: *Introduction to Psalms*, trans. Nogalski]. Given my limited access to this translated introduction to the Psalms, I render the original German myself.

[56] E. g., Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, esp. 397–404; idem, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., xciv.

of their correspondence. This gap allowed him to declare, "Occasionally it is even possible to see the same material passing through different literary types, being transformed on each occasion in the spirit of a new age."[57] In addition to exhibiting a theoretical breakage, the statement betrayed his conception of morphology, where a single substance transmuted into multiple manifestations yet somehow still remained the same in essence. Moreover, according to Gunkel, typologizable sociological (rather than localized, concrete, and contingent historical) settings produced, or transformed, a material in characteristic modes of expression, which then permitted a description and analysis of such distinctive features to determine those regular, discernible contexts for the productions or transformations in question. Instead of merely reflecting on the literary shape of one specific specimen in view, the study of form – as in form criticism – centered on typology.[58]

As Gunkel conceived this study of ancient texts, an assessment of genre corresponded to a history of literature. He thus concluded, "One of the most important goals of literary history is to erect an entire building on the foundation of generic observations and to portray the emergence and growth of all Israelite literature."[59] Once identified, abstract typological genres could fall, he believed, into a chronological historical sequence. Since source criticism (*Literarkritik*) centered on the author and date of individual texts, earlier stages of literature would escape its critical grasp, which meant literary history, with its emphasis on genre, could provide the analyst with access to production in an oral society less individualistic in nature, thereby "penetrating deeper in the essence of things."[60] Noting the problems involved in his data – including the fundamentally religious and fragmentary nature of textual preservation as well as later compilation of the biblical literature – Gunkel himself asserted in one essential essay, "As a result, the literary history of Ancient Israel has as its first task the exploration of genres,

[57] Hermann Gunkel, "Fundamental Problems of Hebrew Literary History," in idem, *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*, 57–68, at 66 [GO: "Die Grundprobleme der israelitischen Literaturgeschichte," repr. in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 29–38]. He continued, "For instance, the Saga can be seen passing into the Romance and into the Legend" (ibid.).

[58] As Buss observes, Gunkel did express some reluctance with the specific term "form" (*Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 247–48, cf. 287). With respect to form history (*Formgeschichte*), studying forms in historical context differs from reconstructing said context based on forms, a distinction between diachronic and synchronic inquiry: in addition to Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, esp. 286–308, see Walter Schmithals, "Johannes Weiß als Wegbereiter der Formgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 80, no. 4 (1983): 389–410 [repr. in *Paulus, die Evangelien und das Urchristentum. Beiträge von und zu Walter Schmithals zu seinem 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 328–54, at 329 n. 7].

[59] Gunkel, "Der Micha-Schluß. Zur Einführung in die literaturgeschichtliche Arbeit am Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 2 (1923): 146–78, at 146.

[60] Gunkel, *Die Propheten. Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten, Die Politik der Propheten, Die Religion der Propheten, Schriftstellerei und Formensprache der Propheten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917), 106–07.

their characteristics, and if possible their own historical development …."[61] If Gunkel first conceptualized aesthetics as an appreciation of artistry, he later came to deploy the term with respect to the analysis of genre.[62] Through comparative data, he saw the temporal sequence of generic types yielding a history of literature (*Literargeschichte*). Although this historian of ancient literature argued many genres had coexisted at the same time in the past, he also asserted some genres had preceded others and, even more, did so genetically, that is, in a relationship of derivation from earlier ones.[63] Nevertheless, Gunkel fastened genre to (he would likely say identified it in) a sociological setting, but he argued historical conditions altered those settings themselves. Change in time thus brought change to types.

He did not attempt to write history based on genre; instead, Gunkel hoped to grasp genre in a history he thought already known. With new epochs came new texts, but those epochs stemmed from elsewhere. Two templates guided his way: universal laws governing all history in general and human development in particular and – not dissociated – the history of Israel as reconstructed in accordance to (then) recent rearrangement of the biblical narrative. Consequently, he averred the Hebrews' entrance into Palestine and Moses' foundation of religion destroyed the earliest literature.[64] Certain kinds of material, too, "must have existed" in spite of limited attestation; specialists, not commoners, "must have composed" some stories on account of their sophistication; and Hebrew poetry "must have had" meter since rhythm accompanied song and dance.[65] The essence of Israel writ small, the prophets stood at center as they transitioned from orality to literacy, poetry to prose, and ecstatics to religious philosophers.[66] Conversely, assuming little place for law in ancient Israel and presupposing priestly dominance in the wake of forced migration, Gunkel assigned a lack of personal piety, a poverty of art, and a want of historical sense to subsequent decline in alleged "Jewish" texts, even though these features matched his image of olden days.[67] Jews had jumbled genres, too.[68] The eras of genres – and ergo literature – conformed to those of the past. As Gunkel specified in another crucial study, "The

[61] Gunkel, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 29; he added, "… a task which is all the more important since these genres are no longer in existence today and are therefore not readily understood" (ibid.).

[62] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 234 n. 30; cf. 120 n. 19.

[63] Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 231–34, 252–53; cf. also John W. Rogerson, *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 134; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974), 60–65; Nahkola, *Double Narratives in the Old Testament*, 118–20.

[64] Gunkel, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 31–32.

[65] On genre, see ibid., 37, 39, 42; for specialists, ibid., 50; concerning rhythm, ibid., 29.

[66] Ibid., 58–67.

[67] Cf. ibid., 72–78. Gunkel saw a fork in the road: a legalism preserved among Jews in the form of the Priestly code, scribes, and Pharisees and a prophetic religion conserved in the psalms and then renewed in Jesus (see esp. ibid., 74).

[68] Ibid., 75.

history of Israelite literature is thus the history of Israel's literary genres …."[69] Yet the history of religion loomed large behind it all.

From the history of literature came a history of religion (*Religionsgeschichte*).[70] If typological genres matched historical progression and literary productions bespoke a culture's inner spirit, literature then reflected religion. Integrating the study of genre into pre-literary and literary epochs, Gunkel saw the task of literary history in "demonstrating how the literature of Israel sprang from the history of the people and is the expression of its spiritual life."[71] Similar to his ancestors in biblical scholarship, who had severed strands and sources and then set them in a series to form the history of Israel, Gunkel serialized the earlier stages of literature – from genres in oral society – to do the same himself, though with a focus on religion. "We can have no religious history without a literary history," he proclaimed, "for how can we hope to understand the contents if we do not trouble ourselves about the form?"[72] While Gunkel's reconstruction of histories religious and literature hence proved mutually supporting, little external control provided a foundation for them.

Time and again, Gunkel claimed his interpretive program presupposed and yet surpassed the project of source criticism, even if he did stop short of declaring a final supersession. Whether law in ancient society, abstraction in primitive thought, simplicity in older creations, or values in ethics of yore, common external criteria helped Gunkel classify then sequence the biblical texts for a reconstruction of Israelite religion. This serialization reinforced not only his methods but also results; it may have added shape or modified certain features but did not, in the end, disfigure the narrative long in place within the history of theology and the related narrative of ancient Israel. Notwithstanding the point of departure for his empirical undertakings or the potential correctness of the destination in his

[69] Gunkel, "Die Grundprobleme der israelitischen Literaturgeschichte," in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze,* 31 [cf. ET: "Fundamental Problems of Hebrew Literary History," 59, which presents a looser rendering]; see further Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 166–79; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 173–84.

[70] On this identification, cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 104–06, 166–79.

[71] Hermann Gunkel, "Bibelwissenschaft, 1. Altes Testament, C. Literaturgeschichte Israels," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung*, Vol. 1, *A–Deutschland*, 1st ed., ed. Friedrich Michael Schiele (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1909), 1189–94, at 1194; cf. idem, "Literaturgeschichte, Biblische, 2. Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 3, *J–Me*, 2nd ed., ed. Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1929), 1677–80.

[72] Gunkel, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," in *Fifth International Congress of Free Christianity and Religious Progress, Berlin, August 5–10, 1910: Proceedings and Papers*, ed. Charles W. Wendte (Berlin-Schöneberg: Protestantischer Schriftenvertrieb/ London: Williams & Norgate, 1911), 114–25, at 120 [GO: "Die Religionsgeschichte und die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," in *Fünfter Weltkongress für freies Christentum und religiösen Fortschritt, Berlin, 5. bis 10. August 1910. Protokoll der Verhandlungen*, ed. Max Fischer and Friedrich Michael Schiele (Berlin-Schöneberg: Protestantischer Schriftenvertrieb, 1910), 169–80].

conclusions, both operations were oriented toward a sense of progress in history, a personal piety in religion, and a languish in Judaism. Navigating the very same material by many a shared assumption, each approach ran in a circle to some extent and at certain points aground.

6.2 A Cause for Comparison; or, Everything's a Whole

In 1897, an academic altercation materialized between Julius Wellhausen and Eduard Meyer. Wellhausen had composed a damning book review that prompted Meyer to pen a reply of 26 pages.[73] The spark flared up from a friction of methodology on the tinder of Jewish origins, with the orientalist preferring a particularistic analysis for historical development, the ancient historian a universalistic one.[74] Such a harsh evaluation gave Meyer and Gunkel something more to share. Two years later, Wellhausen would provoke a comparable, lengthy response from Gunkel with yet another negative assessment, repudiating Gunkel's inquiries into matters of diffusion and into the distant past, that is, the study of longer traditions.[75] In both cases, Wellhausen rebuffed any widening or lengthening of the historiographic lens. Gunkel would not be dissuaded. Sketching a history of Israelite literature, he declared, "Our scholarship has the responsibility to assemble all the material that will then also yield the evidence whether related stories originated independently or are based on another story."[76] Rather than reside in the great intellectual edifice of narrow, internal source criticism that had towered for most of the century, he stood tall upon the beaches of novel academic inquiry as waves of new texts and tides of new methods poured in at the *fin de siècle* – though those sands at times gave way. Comparison, for Gunkel, became the *sine qua non* of scholarship.

Across his multifaceted oeuvre, Gunkel drew countless comparisons, on full display in the third edition of his commentary on Genesis.[77] However, the justification for juxtaposition went largely unexpressed; furthermore, the rationale of these comparisons often differed, subtly and without explanation. In some cases,

---

[73] Eduard Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Eine historische Untersuchung* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1896); Julius Wellhausen, review of *Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Eine historische Untersuchung*, by Eduard Meyer, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 159, no. 2 (1897): 89–97; Eduard Meyer, *Julius Wellhausen und meine Schrift* Die Entstehung des Judenthums. *Eine Erwiderung* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1897).

[74] See Kratz, "Eyes and Spectacles"; idem, "Die Entstehung des Judentums."

[75] Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen"; cf. Gunkel to Meyer, March 16, 1901, in Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 81.

[76] Gunkel, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 34. In fact, Wellhausen had recommended to the editor that Gunkel write the essay (Klatt, *Hermann Gunke*l, 263 n. 7, cf. 167 n. 4).

[77] On the significant difference between the first and third editions, see Warner, "Primitive Saga Men."

he sought the connection of two known data; in others, he proceeded from known to unknown. These analytical moves therefore merit scrutiny. The first kind of collation proceeded from an ethnological typology, which corresponded to linguistic classification. Gunkel referred to Semitic languages and peoples alike, with the Hebrews constituting a subgroup.[78] With this rather standard classification, which regarded (nomadic) Beduins ancestral to (settled or semi-nomadic) Semites, he extrapolated from one group to another as part of the same ethnographic series, which accounted for his frequent citation of Georg Jacob's (1862–1937) *Altarabisches Beduinenleben* and Littmann's *Arabische Beduinenerzählungen* to explain various passages in Genesis.[79] A second source of data stemmed from geography. Even if some peoples had no genetic or ethnological connection, they could still have various elements in common, for diffusion could radiate thought or practice migrate from one place to another. Gunkel thus introduced the Elamites as a non-Semitic people yet placed them in the cultural sphere of Babylonia.[80] In fact, he explicitly alluded to cultural fields (*Kulturkreise*), an anthropological theory associated especially with early twentieth-century Austria but also present among Panbabylonian philologists, with whom Gunkel had no small affinity, less in his conception of astral mythology than in his understanding of diffusion across culture complexes and linguistic contexts.[81] Ubiquitous but implicit – and therefore all the more important – a third pillar of comparison rested on simultaneity. Peoples concurrent with ancient Israel (all the more if mentioned in the Bible) offered an unquestioned set of data for the enterprise. As a fourth comparative class, Gunkel availed himself of modern children to understand the Israelites of old. He affirmed the accuracy of ancient storytelling and wrote about "our children," who reckon change as error.[82] Gunkel saw the same portrayal of hoary ancestors as children in his own sources as well, apparent in the biblical description of Adam and Eve in the garden.[83] Expressly endorsing this procedure, he united children with "lower" cultural stages and thus pursued a fifth mode of comparison.[84] A premise of primitivity allowed the modern to overcome historical time with geographic space by collapsing the two together. To consider circumcision in ancient Israel, which he labelled a survival (*Überlebsel*), Gunkel listed the Egyptians, Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites, Arabs, and Phoenicians of old alongside

[78] Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., 41, 83, 90, 95, 243, 252, 392.

[79] Georg Jacob, *Altarabisches Beduinenleben nach den Quellen geschildert*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1897); Enno Littmann, *Arabische Beduinenerzählungen*, 2 vols. (Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Straßburg 3; Strasbourg: Trübner, 1908). For such comparisons, see Gunkel, *Genesis*, lxi, 46–48, 190–93, 195; cf. esp. idem, "What Is Left of the Old Testament," in idem, *What Remains of the Old Testament*, 13–56, at 44.

[80] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., 154.

[81] Ibid., 6, 37, 122; cf. Kurtz, "Axes of Inquiry," 287–89.

[82] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., lxv, cf. also xxxiv.

[83] Ibid., 14–15, 17–18.

[84] Ibid., 30–31.

contemporary peoples of Africa, South America, and Polynesia.[85] Perceptions of heaven likewise led him across space and time in search of similarity.[86] Sixth, the modern class system provided him with material to understand Israelite culture. Both the medieval and the modern German peasantry (*Bauerntum*) therefore offered insight into practices from ancient Israel.[87] Seventh, and finally, Gunkel derived material for such correspondence from genre or technology. German songs of heroism ran counter to the later book of folktales (*Volksbuch*) just as ancient poetic style differed from a later prosaic one.[88]

However, Gunkel was no flake. His juxtapositions, no matter how undisciplined or sweeping they may seem, did not proceed from parallelomania but rather extended principles already long established within the human sciences, however questionable they may appear at present. In his "Theses on Comparison," the ever-excellent Bruce Lincoln discerns three forms of what he calls strong comparison: (a) "those that claim to reveal universal patterns," (b) "those that claim to demonstrate a genetic relation among specific peoples and phenomena," and (c) "those that claim to trace diffusion of certain traits from one group to the other over the course of history."[89] Though not articulated so, Gunkel undertook them all. Ultimately, the issue hinged on origins, a priority for his research. No matter how haphazard or frenetic such comparison may seem, a dual theoretical system actually underwrote his consideration of ostensibly like phenomena: monogenesis (homology/diffusion) and polygenesis (analogy/parallels). While the first entailed a borrowing, the second implied independence – a contrast in relationship Gunkel himself distinguished.[90]

Even a genetically unrelated datum could provide Gunkel with evidence for a given object of inquiry, though. In the final analysis, he conceptualized all phenomena as fundamentally monogenetic insofar as he upheld a view of anthropology that presupposed a unity of all humanity:

> Now if the religion of Israel steps into the centre of our sphere of investigation, we are convinced that the religion can only be recognized if we conceive it as bound up with history. In doing so we are starting out from the ground-thought which, at the present day, rules all true historical investigation, namely, that the spiritual life of mankind is a unity, and that it is, by a certain orderly arrangement, bound together as a whole. In this mighty cohesion

[85] Ibid., 269–70.

[86] Ibid., 106–07, cf. also his discussion of the Tree of Life (7–8) in addition to Lot's wife (213).

[87] Ibid., 195.

[88] Ibid., xxix–xxx, cf. lvi; see also his contrast between the two at xlii, xlvi.

[89] Bruce Lincoln, "Theses on Comparison (with Cristiano Grottanelli)," in idem, *Gods and Demons, Priests and Scholars: Critical Explorations in the History of Religions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 121–30, at 122.

[90] Cf. Gunkel, review of *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, by Reischle, 1105–07; idem, "Ägyptische Parallelen zum Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 63 (1909): 531–39, at 531–33 [repr. in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 131–41]; idem, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 32–34.

which moves toward mysterious ends which only faith can comprehend, everything has come into being by a continuing process, operated upon and still operating, nothing is isolated, everything is connected with everything else, each with its own special character and yet in some measure to be brought into comparison with the rest.[91]

Consequently, Gunkel could critique "the old school" of Old Testament scholarship, which confined its comparison largely to pre-Islamic Arabs, since more recent research had demonstrated how Israelite religion existed on a "higher" cultural level: temporality entered only to claim this loftier level had been reached earlier in time.[92] He shared with Wellhausen that German conception of history which entailed perceptible laws, developmental stages, and ineluctable progress and simply extended the logic of unity for his comparative endeavors.[93]

His statement on history was ahistorical, however. As Jonathan Smith has revealed with his characteristic brilliance, such a comparative endeavor proved to be typological, a morphological enterprise with limited consideration of contingency, causality, or temporality.[94] In principle, Gunkel may have accepted or rejected monogenesis for specific cultural phenomena, but in the end, he traced even polygenetic developments to some basal human nature, which permitted him to speak of "psychological laws" and "eternal orderings."[95] Gunkel vacillated between two separate anthropological hypotheses, which contemplated whether cultural productions derived from the realm of a more deterministic biology or a free intellectual spirit. Undoubtedly, Gunkel would concur with Roman playwright Terence *homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto* ("I am human: I deem nothing human foreign to me").

Whether his history of tradition or that of literature, Gunkel's interpretive program oft revolved around comparison, which meant the question of priority – and implicitly importance – therefore surfaced without end. Long the blade of radicals and bane of the orthodox, diffusion centered on age and thus prestige – authority aligned with antiquity. During the Babel–Bible Affair, which concerned Israel's debt to Babylonia, Gunkel addressed the problem of dependence. On the one hand, he maintained, "*Israel's religion in the classical period is independent from that of Babylon*."[96] On the other hand, he openly conceded any number of borrowings but considered them no real threat to the import of ancient Israel.

---

[91] Gunkel, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 121; cf. idem, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 25–26.

[92] Gunkel, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 115–17; cf. idem, "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion," 535; and idem, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 89.

[93] Cf. Gunkel, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 121–22.

[94] See p. 146 n. 92 above.

[95] Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 48; idem, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 25–26; see also, inter alia, ibid., 15; idem, "Das Alte Testament im Licht der modernen Forschung," 63.

[96] Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 42, with italics original in the English but not the German (cf. idem, *Israel und Babylonien*, 31).

More than simply declare a similitude of two phenomena bound by genealogy, Gunkel placed a premium on particularity, what he called an "Israelitization" in this instance.[97] (Goethe's use of an older legend for *Faust* offered a modern example.[98]) Here, his historical venture corresponded more closely to the actual evolutionary perspective at work in natural science, which stressed variability, adaptation, and environment – a framework that actually contrasted the morphological construction of fixed, universal developmental stages so operative in anthropological constructions and frequently misdescribed as evolutionary. Further still, elucidation of the general would illuminate the particular.

Far beyond particularity, however, Israel's distinctiveness was a foregone conclusion for Gunkel. This chosen people – at least before its supposed and much-bemoaned demise into Judaism – produced legends "perhaps the most beautiful and most profound ever found on earth" that, when compared with those of ancients, revealed "their high religious and ethical superiority."[99] Likewise, Gunkel argued they showed themselves to be "by far the most gifted people poetically among all peoples of the ancient Orient."[100] From the very beginning, moreover, not only did Israel have a "propensity" (*Neigung*) for monotheism, but this propensity was even independent (*autochthon*), Israel being "the classic people of monotheism."[101] Most of all, however, the prophets' "most inner connection of religion with morality" represented "the reason through which Israel's religion mounts exalted above all other religion of the ancient Orient!"[102] Through the study of tradition and the venture of comparison, Gunkel's project hoped to recover those very prophets, the inspired persons of yore who embodied the religious qualities he so admired.

6.3 Inspired Persons Past

Gunkel glorified the patron saints of the German Empire, especially those of cultural Protestantism. If Martin Luther (1483–1546), in his estimation, had translated the Bible with unparalleled "power and warmth," Goethe then "drank in Luther's glorious translation, and … by making his own Luther's powerful ['] Bible German['] … invigorated the German literary language of his time,

[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid., 32.
[99] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., xii, lxxxv.
[100] Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 166.
[101] Gunkel, *Die Propheten*, 92; idem, *Israel and Babylon*, 39; cf. also idem, "What Is Left of the Old Testament?," repr. in idem, *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*, 13–56, at 56. Originally published in German, this third essay first appeared as "Was haben wir am Alten Testament," *Deutsche Rundschau* 161 (1914): 215–41, and later, in book form, as *Was bleibt vom Alten Testament?* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916).
[102] Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 44.

which had degenerated to insipidity."[103] Yet even higher than these giants stood the mighty Herder. It was he who had called attention to the Bible's artistry, who had "announced the splendor of the Old Testament to the world with tongues of fire," and, furthermore, who had left behind a history of literature as his "final will" (*Testament*).[104] Indeed, Gunkel invoked him on numerous occasions and quoted directly from *The Oldest Document of the Human Race* and *Maranatha*, too.[105] As Daniel Weidner notes, Herder's *On the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* saw something of a revival at the turn of the twentieth century, thanks in no small part to Gunkel, who had read the work already in his youth.[106] Seeing as the "Swift of Strasbourg" had exerted such heavy influence on biblical interpretation in the century up to when Gunkel himself explicitly appealed to "the great Herder" in his own undertakings, the continuity and discontinuity in their undertakings merits greater scrutiny.[107] The question still remains as to just how much of Herder's enterprise survived – intact – the shifts within the human sciences throughout the nineteenth century.

Both a history of literature and an evaluation of aesthetics – so characteristic of Gunkel's work – breathed the spirit of Herder himself. Certainly, countless

---

[103] Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, 4th ed., vi; idem, "What Is Left of the Old Testament?," 20. So, too, Gunkel commended the translations wrought by Wellhausen: "No modern – it would have to be Wellhausen, whom we have to thank for an extraordinary translation of the Minor Prophets – could hope to reach the power and warmth of Luther's locution" (idem, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, 4th ed., vi). Littmann likewise praised Wellhausen's mastery of the German language, especially his ability to translate Arabic: Littmann, "Erinnerung an Julius Wellhausen," 20.

[104] Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 22; idem, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., v–vi; cf. idem, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 79.

[105] Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., v–vi, 12, 13, 15, 16, 27; idem, "Das alte Testament im Licht der modernen Forschung," 52; idem, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 79; idem, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 120. In his Genesis commentary (3rd ed.), Gunkel directly quoted Herder's *Älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts* [repr. in Herder, *Schriften zum Alten Testament*, ed. Rudolf Smend (Bibliothek Deutscher Klassiker 93; Johann Gottfried Herder Werke 5; Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1993)], at 523, 533, 536, 546, 570. Gunkel also cited Herder's work on the New Testament, namely, *MAPAN. AΘA. [Maran. Atha.]. Das Buch von der Zukunft des Herrn, des Neuen Testaments Siegel* (Riga: Hartknoch, 1779), though sometimes indirectly: cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 183, 185, 212.

[106] Daniel Weidner, "Einleitung. Lektüren im Geist der Ebräischen Poesie," in idem, ed., *Urpoesie und Morgenland. Johann Gottfried Herders "Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie"* (LiteraturForschung 6; Berlin: Kulturverlag Kadmos, 2008), 9–21, at 18; cf. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 216–17, 294–95.

[107] On Herder's significance in biblical scholarship, see esp. Christoph Bultmann, *Die biblische Urgeschichte in der Aufklärung. Johann Gottfried Herders Interpretation der Genesis als Antwort auf die Religionskritik David Humes* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 110; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1999); as well as the still useful if limited Thomas Willi, *Herders Beitrag zum Verstehen des Alten Testaments* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik 8; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1971); cf., more broadly, Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible*, 168–76; Martin Keßler and Volker Leppin, ed., *Johann Gottfried Herder. Aspekte seines Lebenswerks* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 92; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005).

scholars have noted a resemblance in their undertakings and, furthermore, suggested a relationship of genealogy between them. These declarations, however, have seldom shown any rigorous exploration beyond more simple statements of similitude or difference, rarely pressing into that analytically more difficult yet undoubtedly more informative nitty-gritty of how and why.[108] Precisely what was inspiration and what resuscitation merits more consideration. Apart from the question of dependence, Gunkel moved further than Herder in two crucial, closely connected yet separable domains. First, Gunkel went behind the Primeval History of Genesis as the earliest human document to arrive at the older, oral traditions lying beyond it.[109] If he understood Old Testament interpretation as seizing the religious content of a text, that very content consisted of religious manifestations and great personalities behind the text itself. Secondly, Gunkel meditated on the aesthetic qualities of literature, evoking Herder and Wellhausen by name. But his inquiry led him to contemplate more than mere artistry; rather, aesthetics led him to forms, forms to genres, genres to religion, and religion to inspired individuals.[110] He ultimately developed a history of literature (and therefore history of religion) by designing a history of genre, with its full integration of setting, structure, and subject.[111] With their impulses in Herder, each of these endeavors by Gunkel – aesthetics and literary history – sought to ascertain a national spirit from a national literature. More fundamentally, however, aesthetics in Gunkel's program became a form of hermeneutics. The contrast shows the contours of his enterprise.

Based on his theory of language and mind, Herder had formulated a theory of interpretation that comprised two discernible sides – namely, the linguistic and

---

[108] See, e. g., Baumgartner, "Zum 100. Geburtstag von Hermann Gunkel"; idem, "Alttestamentliche Einleitung und Literaturgeschichte," *Theologische Rundschau* n.s. 8 (1936): 179–222, at 188–90; Markus Witte, "Von der Analyse zur Synthese – Historisch-kritische Anmerkungen zu Hermann Gunkels Konzept einer israelitischen Literaturgeschichte," in *Hermann Gunkel revisited,* ed. Eisen and Gerstenberger, 21–51; Gary Stansell, "The Poet's Prophet: Bishop Robert Lowth's Eighteenth-Century Commentary on Isaiah," in *"As Those Who Are Taught": The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL,* ed. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull, (SBL Symposium Series 27; Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 223–42, at 239–42. Incidentally, although Stansell supposes Gunkel never referred to Lowth by name, Lowth did, in fact, receive such citation in *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 98 – a reference Smend overlooks as well (Smend, "Lowth in Deutschland," repr. in idem, *Bibel und Wissenschaft. Historische Aufsätze* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 51–70, at 70).

[109] Uwe Becker, "'Die älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts'. J. G. Herders Auslegung der Urgeschichte und die Frage nach dem Spezifikum der israelitisch-jüdischen Religion," in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog. Festschrift für Otto Kaiser zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Markus Witte, 2 vols. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 345/1–2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 919–41, cf. 925–26 and 931–33; see also Knight, *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel*, 48, 51.

[110] Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 22–24; cf. idem, "Fundamental Problems of Hebrew Literary History," 65.

[111] See, most of all, Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 125, 175, 364; Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, esp. 110–12, 118, 233–35, 265.

the psychological. Michael Forster has dissected these dimensions in detail.[112] The first orbit entailed three theses: (1) thought essentially depends upon language; (2) meanings/concepts consist in the usage of words; and (3) conceptualization has its basis in affective and perceptual sensation. These principles carried essential implications: language could serve as a reliable indicator of thought, interpretation required determination of word-usage, and understanding conceptions involved an imaginative reproduction of sensation.[113] Here, the second side came into play, specifically as a means of overcoming variability in humanity and breaches in epochs, cultures, and persons (i. e., relativism), both emphasized by Herder.[114] In fact, Herder's meditation on historical method had first stemmed from the problems of literary criticism, where such distances divided the critic's interpretive efforts from an author's original purposes and values – a connection underlined by Frederick Beiser.[115] Herder thus championed the psychological side to recapture authorial sensation, to resolve textual ambiguities, and to penetrate an author's individuality.[116] With such a stress on the past, he asserted the embeddedness and therefore changeability of genre in specific cultural contexts and affirmed an author's intention in choosing one – which then demanded attention to genre for interpretation – thereby arguing against the kind of generic apriorism Gunkel would assume.[117] As one particular mode, Herder advanced a process of "divination," which meant neither prophecy nor intuition but fallible conjecture or hypothesis, to go beyond the limitations of empirical evidence. For this reason, interpretation of the past did not lie across some great divide from the pursuits of natural science.[118] In addition, Herder proposed the need to empathize or "feel one's way in" (*einfühlen*) as a bridge across the hermeneutical distance between interpreter and interpreted, for he believed "a sort of imaginative recapturing of relevant sensations is possible which does not involve actually *having* or *having had* them and that it is only *this* that is necessary for

[112] See Michael N. Forster, *After Herder: Philosophy of Language in the German Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 15–25, 55–90; idem, "Introduction," in Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, trans. and ed. Michael N. Forster (Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), vii–xxxv.

[113] Forster, *After Herder*, 18.

[114] See further ibid., esp. 36–41.

[115] Frederick C. Beiser, *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 141–45; cf. also John Zammito, "Herder and Historical Metanarrative: What's Philosophical about History?," in *A Companion to the Works of Johann Gottfried Herder*, ed. Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke (Rochester: Camden House, 2009), 65–91.

[116] Forster, *After Herder*, 19–22.

[117] See ibid., esp. 33–35, 173–76.

[118] Ibid., 140–41; cf. Karl Menges, "Particular Universals: Herder on National Literature, Popular Literature, and World Literature," in *A Companion to the Works of Johann Gottfriend Herder*, ed. Adler and Koepke, 189–214.

understanding."[119] If Herder stopped short of traversing that threshold, Gunkel leapt across it.

Gunkel wanted to identify himself with his object. This agenda he set forth in his programmatic "Goals and Methods for Explanation of the Old Testament."[120] As regards the aspiration, he contended, "The human soul, that mysterious inner life which reveals itself to the outer world by declaring itself, that is the truly valuable thing (*das ist das eigentlich Wertvolle*)."[121] Gunkel compared this task to a restoration of archaeological ruins or ancient colors but underscored the need for intuition, even as he qualified that sustained reflection should help restrain such "noble imagination (*edle Phantasie*)."[122] While he described the exegetical ideal as a mirroring, listening, or channeling the great pious men of old, Gunkel insisted on the disciplined, methodical nature of this venture, as opposed to an unfettered "impressionism." He offered few hints, however, as to the checks he had in mind. So, too, he began the volume that reissued this article with his earliest conviction: "the final goal of the work on the Bible is to look into the heart of the men of religion, to empathize (*mitempfinden*) with and sufficiently describe their innermost thoughts."[123] In another, even more revealing essay, Gunkel stated, "We must penetrate so deeply into their experiences that we can sympathize (*nachfühlend*) with them, that we can repeat (*wiederholen*) them in ourselves, and become the interpreters of them to our own generation."[124] The objective, then, was for the interpreter to reach into the past and then spirit such experience into the present.[125] As he wrote in one review, "… this is precisely our finest task, to see that personal life [i. e., of 'the individual great person'], which we sympathetically repeat in ourselves (*nachfühlend in uns wiederholen*) as though it were our own, in connection with grand history."[126] Prefacing the reprint of his licentiate dissertation on the spirit, Gunkel reflected on the inquiry ten years later and regretted – though still justified – his earlier analytical distance from the object of inquiry, his inability to recreate (*nachempfinden*) pneumatic experience as his own; he avowed the need for an interpreter "to relive (*nachzuerleben*) the inner states of" and "by some means place himself in the position to sympathize with (*nachzufühlen*)" the pneumatic person, affirming the real psychological processes of such figures.[127]

[119] Forster, *After Herder*, 141–46, quote at 144.

[120] Cf. p. 255 n. 11 supra.

[121] Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 12.

[122] Ibid., 14.

[123] Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze*, v–vi.

[124] Gunkel, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 119 [cf. GO: "Die Religionsgeschichte und die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," 174].

[125] Cf. Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, 4th ed., vii; idem, *Die Genesis*, 1st ed., foreword.

[126] Gunkel, review of *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, by Reischle, 1109–10.

[127] Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, repr. ed., vi–vii. Even in the first edition, Gunkel referred to the "very concrete views and deep inner experiences, which one must recreate (*nachempfinden*) after the apostle [sc. Paul] to understand his dogmatic statements" (idem, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, 1st ed., 62). Cf. also the psychological evaluation of 4 Esdras in,

His work on the prophets also affirmed an internal reality of ecstatic experience; in fact, one early study of the subject bore a telling subtitle, subsequently removed: "The Secret Experiences of the Prophets of Israel: A Study of Religious Psychology."[128] Experience of the past was the aim for present research.

Now, Gunkel did, in fact, question the possibility of achieving his exegetical ideal and noted the gap between Old Testament piety and that of Christianity. However, he did so *en passant*, without any indication of either the venture's limitations or the religious chasm's nature – to all appearances, little more than a throwaway qualification.[129] Words were only the articulation of thought and sensation (*Empfindungen*), however, and even those thoughts and sensations were merely expressions of "the effervescent, stirred soul."[130] To seize that very spirit Gunkel had to reach behind the text, to move beyond objectification to the experiencing subject. As for the means to that end, he outlined five operations in his programmatic essay – placed in a chronological and hierarchical series. The sequence began with empirical procedures but ended with a kind of psychological projection, the ultimate ambition being identification with his object: (1) textual criticism, (2) political history and archaeology, (3) literary criticism, (4) aesthetics and literary history, and (5) "the true theological problem," that is, history of religion.[131] Equating religion with piety – "the inner life" – Gunkel then insisted on "historical exegesis."[132] Such historical explication centered on circumstance of the past insofar as it conditioned the production of biblical literature, on the one hand, and the spiritual (*geistig*) unity of all peoples, on the other. Elsewhere, he described "history" (*Geschichte*) as an entire worldview (*Weltanschauung*) bequeathed by "our great idealistic thinkers and poets."[133] All things were connected in a teleological order, revealed by faith: "It is not coincidence (*Zufall*) that generates it; an eternal spirit presides in all; it is the unity of the many, the link of what conflicts; it leads the low to a higher being; it draws up to itself those who follow it."[134] The cohesion of all humanity, "bound together by order and law,"

---

e. g., Gunkel, *Der Prophet Esra*, xviii–xxiii. Elsewhere, he could use the same language without suggesting a technical attempt at affective replication: cf. idem, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, 4th ed., 70, i. e., on Ps 42–43 (*sich im tiefsten einig fühlen*); idem, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., xii (*empfinden, mitfühlen*).

[128] See esp. Gunkel, *Die Propheten*, 5–7, 29–31, 70, 90, which reprints his "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten Israels." In yet another printing of the article, he listed trends that had contributed to such an apprehension of the prophets: neoromanticism, impressionism, the study of other religions, the history of literature, and psychology (in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, xx). The content of the essay varied across its iterations; on the original publication, cf. p. 258 n. 23 above.

[129] Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 13, 17.

[130] Ibid., 12.

[131] Ibid., 17–25.

[132] Ibid., 25.

[133] Gunkel, "Das Alte Testament im Licht der modernen Forschung," 55.

[134] Ibid., 63.

thus permitted his psychological transcendence across the hermeneutical gap of time and place to reach inspired persons.[135]

Aesthetics acted as a mode of doing so. Gunkel explained the need "to empathize (*empfinden*) strongly and deeply" and referred to the "long-lasting, repeated, and loving contemplation" that would yield an appreciation of a text's aesthetic distinction: "[The exegete] should devote the most beautiful hours of his life to it, when the feeling is nimble, intuition alert (*da das Gefühl beweglich und die Anschauungskraft rege ist*)."[136] Furthermore, he cast the interpretive task as "more an art than science," stressing the need for "inspiration" and contended, "The artist, too, creates in a state of inspiration (*in der Begeisterung*), when his heart becomes warm and his soul wide. It is thus a deep truth already in everyday life that only love brings true understanding."[137] Anticipating the kind of phenomenology that would dominate theology – and cryptotheology – for much of the twentieth century, Gunkel went so far as to claim only the religious person could understand religion or its history.[138] As a result, his methodological program exceeded a mere empiricism and even intuitive empathy to achieve a rather vague yet sure participation in the internal sensations of his ancient pious subjects, the inexplicit caveats notwithstanding.[139]

Despite this seeming similarity with Herder, Gunkel's interpretive endeavor betrayed a different ends and means for reviving the spirit of old. While some critics have contemplated the impact of Herder on Gunkel in the venture of aesthetic appreciation and literary history or, less critically, generalized their relationship with that enigmatic category "influence," others have directly correlated the hermeneutics of the two.[140] Gunkel invoked, however, only Herder's

---

[135] Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes."

[136] Ibid., 23.

[137] Ibid., 14, 15.

[138] Ibid., 16–17. As Heschel recognizes, Ritschl had advanced a similar claim in arguing only Christians could properly reconstruct Christian history (idem, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, 123); so, too, Rudolf Otto later suggested religion as experience could only be truly analyzed by those who themselves had experienced it, although he subsequently modified this position (cf. Gregory D. Alles, "Toward a Genealogy of the Holy: Rudolf Otto and the Apologetics of Religion," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 69, no. 2 [2001]: 323–41; Todd A. Gooch, *The Numinous and Modernity: An Interpretation of Rudolf Otto's Philosophy of Religion* [Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 293; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000], 167).

[139] But as Spieckermann observes, Gunkel's larger project ultimately undercut this enterprise insofar as individual authors tended to disappear in favor of traditions and collectors (idem, "From Biblical Exegesis to Reception History," 338–39).

[140] Bernhard W. Anderson, "Introduction: Martin Noth's Traditio-Historical Approach in the Context of Twentieth-Century Biblical Research," in Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, trans. Bernhard W. Anderson (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972), xviii–xix [GO: Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 1st ed. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948)]; Ronald Hendel, "Introduction," in *Reading Genesis: Ten Methods*, ed. Ronald Hendel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 2–4; John H. Hayes, *Interpreting Ancient Israelite History, Prophecy, and Law*, ed. Brad E. Kelle (Eugene: Cascade, 2013), 53, 165–66; Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, 364; Scholtz, "The Phenomenon of

work on the Bible, none of his sustained reflections on philosophy in general or those on history in particular. Not known for documentation, he certainly could have read such disquisitions and opted not to cite them. If Gunkel did, in fact, engage Herder's hermeneutics through sustained deliberation, he misunderstood the venture, silently altered the objective, or employed a literary flourish that gave the impression of significant extension.

Whatever the case may be, Gunkel's programmatic writings suggested a psychological projection and affective communion beyond the empathy and intuition more firmly grounded in (fallible and corrigible) empiricism as forwarded by Herder, who had far more interest in addressing the problem of historical and cultural relativity.[141] Klatt can thus conclude, "[Gunkel] did not simply want to become concurrent with the time of the text; he wanted to become identical with the creator or thinker of the idea."[142] Even further, the portrait Gunkel sketched implied neither a risk of error nor a sense of danger. With respect to the second, surely not every emotion nor each individual person should see reanimation, including those in the Bible: Herder had demurred from actually sharing David's hatred – in *On the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* no less – and Gunkel would not have

'Historicism' as a Backcloth of Biblical Scholarship," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament,* Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century,* ed. Sæbø 85; cf. Roderich Barth, "Innerlichkeit und Ausdruck. Aufgeklärte Frömmigkeit im Anschluß an Herder," in *Protestantismus – Aufklärung – Frömmigkeit. Historische, systematische und praktisch-theologische Zugänge,* ed. Andreas Kubik (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 22–37, at 32–34; Detlef Dieckmann, *Segen für Isaak. Eine rezeptionsästhetische Auslegung von Gen 26 und Kotexten* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 329; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 37–38, 43 n. 2.

[141] Gunkel commended and referred to Hermann Hupfeld's work on the psalms – especially with regard to genre – but he ostensibly adopted neither terminology nor methodology with respect to divination (cf. Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 8; idem, *Die Psalmen*, 4th ed. [Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 2/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926], 637, whereas Friedrich Baethgen had authored the first through third editions of the latter volume, published between 1892 and 1904; despite the publication date of 1926 provided in this first edition by Gunkel, the 1968 and 1986 reprints of the work listed its appearance as 1929, which seems to account for the confusion in the secondary literature with regard to publication year, perhaps complicated further by the arrival of a new edition of Kittel's work by the same name in 1929, as part of the similarly-named series Kommentar zum Alten Testament). While Hupfeld explicitly advocated the critical deployment of "analogy" and "divination," he defined the latter in Herder's sense as "conjecture … based on internal reasons (*Vermuthung … nach innern Gründen*)" (Hupfeld, *Ueber Begriff und Methode der sogenannten biblischen Einleitung nebst einer Uebersicht ihrer Geschichte und Literatur* [Marburg: N. G. Elwert's Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1844], 15; cf. idem, "Noch ein Wort über den Begriff der sogenannten biblischen Einleitung," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 34, no. 1 [1861]: 3–28; idem, *Die Psalmen*, 4 vols. [Gotha: Perthes, 1855–62], 2:188). Hupfeld hailed Herder "the great advocate and prophet of the human and the folkloric (*des menschlichen und volksthümlichen*) in the traditions (*Überlieferungen*) and the poesy of all peoples and ages" (cf. Witte, "Von der Analyse zur Synthese – Historisch-kritische Anmerkungen zu Hermann Gunkels Konzept einer israelitischen Literaturgeschichte," in *Hermann Gunkel revisited,* ed. Eisen and Gerstenberger, 23 n. 10, citing Hupfeld, *Ueber Begriff und Methode*, 79).

[142] Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel,* 174, cf. 31.

advocated an identification with later, Jewish (sc. Priestly) writers. Though Gunkel considered only the pious persons of yore, the full implication of his project would permit if not require the regeneration of degenerates as well. His road map to the past led farther than that of Herder – and with more obscure instructions.

Instead, Gunkel might have followed Friedrich Schleiermacher, himself deeply indebted to Herder. Schleiermacher was, after all, an established hero of Protestant theology by this period. Concretely, Gunkel adduced Schleiermacher's introduction to the New Testament, his doctrine of creation, and his notion of piety as subjective expression of religion – documentation of an intellectual engagement beyond the (rather safe) assumption of a more general familiarity through theological education.[143] Now, Schleiermacher had parted ways with Herder when he classed interpretation as art instead of science.[144] As Beiser writes, Herder believed "the laws that govern history are one and the same as those that govern nature."[145] Although Schleiermacher accepted the interpretive dyad of linguistic/grammatical and psychological/technical dimensions, he proceeded from the principle of "divination" as a hypothesis and arrived at the conception of hermeneutics as an art. No method, so he argued, could prescribe precisely how to correlate these two procedures, and understanding always entailed approximation.[146] The contrast between Gunkel's forebears on this point, i. e., the psychological dimension of interpretation, provides two poles for measuring his own relative position to them.

Gunkel's prescriptive contribution to the ends and means of biblical interpretation did indeed reckon the exegetical enterprise as more an art than science.[147] But he drew still a sharper line between theology and science, as evidenced in a lecture attended by Bultmann.[148] So also Gunkel championed the respective boundaries of science and religion when discussing cosmogony in Genesis, where he referred to "the contest 'between theology and geology.'"[149] With this

[143] See Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 194; idem, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., 131; idem, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 119; idem, "Biblische Theologie und biblische Religionsgeschichte: 1. des AT," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 1, *A–D*, 2nd ed., ed. Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1927), 1089–91, at 1090: only the first instance offered explicit citation; the others, only his name; the second appeal – to cosmogony – presumably meant Schleiermacher's *Der christliche Glaube* (§ 41). Cf. also Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 355; see further Paulsen, "Traditionsgeschichtliche Methode und religionsgeschichtliche Schule," 50.

[144] See Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, esp. 292–93; cf. Forster, *After Herder*, 380–81.

[145] Frederick C. Beiser, *The German Historicist Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 100.

[146] For explicit comparison of Herder and Schleiermacher, see Forster, *After Herder*, esp. 137–46, 146–54, 331–36, 391–468.

[147] Cf. Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 14.

[148] De Valerio, *Altes Testament und Judentum im Frühwerk Rudolf Bultmanns*, 55–62.

[149] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., 131.

assertion, Gunkel seemed to side – be it consciously or not – with the Southwest or Baden School of Neo-Kantians, who proposed nomothetic and idiographic means of interpreting the same phenomenon, neither reducible to the other. In line with Herder, however, Schleiermacher never had endorsed a psychological self-projection of the interpreter onto the author. Once more, Gunkel provided no explicit reference to Schleiermacher's work on hermeneutics, and here again, if he did employ them, he either misread, misrepresented, or modified the endeavor. Provided that he did interpret Schleiermacher in this way, at least he found good company. Whereas Berlin philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911) read in Schleiermacher an empathetic self-projection loosed from the empirical side of a dialectical hermeneutics, historian Friedrich Meinecke (1862–1954) construed Herder's venture much the same.[150] Regardless, Gunkel's description of ideal interpretation exceeded even that of Schleiermacher's emphatically controlled, empirical approach. The difference may have been one of degree instead of kind, but the perceived degree of identification with the author of a text proved significant.

Though partially correct and often done, placing Gunkel "in the tradition" of Herder or Schleiermacher without a rigorous comparison either diachronically (concerning the contours of intellectual history across the nineteenth century) or synchronically (regarding the other interpretive options available at the time) ultimately dulls the analytical edge for appraisal of not only Gunkel's undertakings but also the practices or principles he upheld, however modified. Beyond a declaration of similitude or difference, scrutiny of the continuities and discontinuities in a mode of interpretation elucidates its reception, alteration, adaptation, and combination across time, place, and circumstance. At base, the question of how and reflections on why offer a more thorough understanding of what Gunkel wanted to gain, how he sought to grasp it, and why he judged this path to be the best one to do so (no matter the degree of reflection).

Of course, Gunkel may have had no considered theory himself. The force of his conviction notwithstanding, the interpreter demonstrated little engagement with the problem of interpretation or its theorists of varied caliber. He wrote no exposition of the problem, with any explicit statements emerging in either empirical studies, retrospective comments, or apologetic essays that defended *Religionsgeschichte* as an enterprise. Moreover, his programmatic meditations appeared in publications aimed at a broader audience. Gunkel's essay on the ends and means of exegesis first appeared in a periodical for practical theology, where he expressed the conviction that his program should serve "praxis" in the end – a desire he voiced on several different occasions, whether "to promote the knowledge of the ways of God and therefore add to his kingdom" or "to serve the

[150] Forster, *After Herder*, 19, 333, 377–79; Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 294–95.

practical work of the church."[151] Indeed, Gunkel was no theoretician, nor did he claim to be. True, he did have close personal contact with Jewish-born Hegelian philosopher Adolf Lasson (1832–1917); Lasson himself had heard lectures by August Boeckh (1785–1867) as well, the eminent classicist who ostensibly extended Schleiermacher's hermeneutics in the fields of philology and culture.[152] Yet the philosophical underpinnings of Gunkel's historical program seem much less won through careful reflection than absorbed by a kind of intellectual osmosis, revealing, in the words of Erhard Gerstenberger, "an un-reflected mix of theoretical viewpoints, carried away by a staunch belief in the progressive ethical betterment of humankind."[153] Reventlow, too, depicts Gunkelian aesthetics as the result of idealism severed from its metaphysical foundation.[154] In this way, Gunkel betrayed that revived or intensified idealism which was manifest at the *fin de siècle*.

A moment of unification with pious persons of the past was the final destination for the exegetical train that Gunkel engineered. Given the tight cohesion of his program (i. e., how its constituent parts all worked together), the interpretive rails he built may actually run direct – through the history of tradition and transmission, across analysis of form and genre, beyond a concern with sources and settings – without permitting those who would ride along with him to stop off, wherever they desire, before the ultimate end in the personal experience of an individual. He certainly did not design it in such a way. In consequence, questions remain as to whether a part can be separated from the whole, whether the

[151] So Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der alttestamentlichen Exegese," 540 (for the reprint of this essay, he changed the intended beneficiary of such service to "life": cf. idem, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 29); idem, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, x; idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, vii.

[152] Buss suggests a connection of Gunkel to Boeckh as mediated by Lasson (*Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 228, 249–50). Gunkel named Lasson godfather of his daughter, Annemarie, and dedicated his *Ausgewählte Psalmen* to him; on their relationship, see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 99–100, 269–70, 303. In addition, Lasson's portrait hung on Gunkel's office wall (Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 230 n. 9). Throughout his career, Lasson worked on the philosophy of history: cf. idem, "Mechanismus und Teleologie," *Verhandlungen der philosophischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 1 (1875): 1–44; idem, *Über den Zufall* (Philosophische Vorträge 18; Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1918).

[153] Erhard S. Gerstenberger, "Albert Eichhorn and Hermann Gunkel: The Emergence of a History of Religion School," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Sæbø, 454–71, at 464; cf. also idem, "Social Sciences and Form-Criticism: Towards the Generative Force of Life-Settings," in *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible,* ed. Timothy J. Sandoval and Carleen Mandolfo (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 384; London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 84–99, at 85–88; also Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel,* 33–34, 97–98, 264–65.

[154] Henning Graf Reventlow, "The Role of the Old Testament in the German Liberal Protestant Theology of the Nineteenth Century," in *Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms, 1850–1914*, ed. Henning Graf Reventlow and William Farmer (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 192; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 132–48, at 144–45.

methods Gunkel sharpened and applied can function if detached from the larger enterprise and theoretical structure that helped craft them in the first place, be it the study of literary types detached from his conception of ideal forms or the study of religion apart from the search for its origins in individual expression.

The sense of a modern crisis provided no small amount of motivation for this program of interpretation. Gunkel shared with his 1890s generation not only a desire but even an actual demand for cultural renewal, which he thought could come at least in part through attention to the ancient past. Indeed, Gunkel hoped to usher a past piety back into his present. Hardly any other description could surpass his own, composed in the preface to *Die Psalmen*. And so Gunkel can speak himself, as he hoped his ancient authors would:

> Therefore, despite all the scholarly and critical problems, which of course could not be avoided, I have kept it my true task to present the content of the psalms, and that is their religion. This ultimate, sweet core must lie behind the prickly shell; otherwise, all such painstaking work is for naught or only useful as preparatory work. In the process, the highest goal seemed to me … not simply to speak about the religion of the psalms from the exterior (although that cannot, of course, be entirely absent) but to present the piety itself from the inside out. I strove to penetrate the life of these pious persons as they, distressed and afraid, stretched their arms up in supplication or cheered and rejoiced in their God at the pinnacle of their lives. That is, of course, no task whose resolution the conscientious and careful researcher, who ploughs the difficult earth with tireless patience, may find merely on the side. Hours of experience must be spent, when one's own soul is touched by the past, when the melodies from our predecessors' world, long since blown away by the storm of history, begin to sound louder and clearer, until they resonate again, in ancient power and beauty, in the heart of the present person. Such hours of internal listening one can prepare yet never force; it is worth waiting for them.[155]

[155] Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*, vii.

Concluding Remarks

Piety Through History

In the history of modern German scholarship on ancient Israel, Julius Wellhausen and Hermann Gunkel stood upon twin peaks with a valley in between them. From one perspective, the divide seems great indeed, marked by a shift in generations, a reorientation of values in research, and a change in scholarly practices. Wellhausen bore the standard of a mid-century historicist philology anti-romantic in conviction and positivist in disposition. As the orientalist moved his analytical instruments from ancient Israel and early Judaism through formative Islam to primitive Christianity, he wrought the history of literature into the history of a complex constituted by matters of state and nation, religion and politics. Gunkel ultimately mounted a conscious resistance, reaching beyond the world of text and authors to a deeper, internal history of religious experience and expression by inspired individuals. When the historian of religion sought to forge a new set of historiographical tools and deploy them universally – from Christianity through Judaism to Israel and as far as Babylonia – he hoped these inquiries into the past would speak, ideally, to his own present. Such disparity between them ranged from prioritizing either canonical or non-canonical sources to setting the historical distance necessary to review for the proper interpretation of a text. In consequence, they came to represent two dominant models of biblical interpretation and historical reconstruction into the twentieth century. Depending on the angle, one of them may seem higher than the other.

From a different position, however, a view wider and more elevated, the gap between them narrows, and both Wellhausen and Gunkel appear far closer than apart. This continuity extended beyond the realm of mere biography, the two being Göttingen-trained biblical scholars from Lutheran clergy households of northern German stock. Together they championed a liberal interpretation of Christian scripture, endorsed a cultural Protestantism, and promoted the interests of their own educated middle class. In the realm of intellectual history, their historiography of ancient Israel proved more alike than different in the end. Gunkel fully acknowledged a debt to the savant he so admired. In a drafted letter to Karl Budde, he revealed his hope that the future might consider him "a true Wellhausian, who brought critical Old Testament scholarship into a different period and thereby saved it from decay."[1] Yet Wellhausen also found accord with

[1] Published in Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 179. Although the draft has no date listed, Gunkel

his younger colleague when he conceded to Harnack, "In substance, I often agree with Gunkel, but I've never learned anything from him."[2] He actually agreed with more than he ever would have wanted to admit. Part of this commonality resulted from chronology and consensus, with Gunkel treading into the past along the path that Wellhausen had done so much to cut. These two shared, however, an epistemological and historiographical orientation deeper still. In many ways, Gunkel simply extended a logic upheld by Wellhausen himself. The junior scholar thus expanded the principles and ofttimes rendered more explicit the assumptions operative in the work of his elder.

So far, this book has scrutinized the history of historiography for ancient Israel in modern Germany by analyzing two foundational moments, as represented in the life and work of Wellhausen and Gunkel. Historical claims advanced by the biblical text were destabilized through source criticism in the first instance and discoveries from other ancient peoples in the second. Hanging in the balance were nothing less than hallowed teachings and understandings of God and world alike. Divided in two parts – with each part devoted to one figure and divided in three chapters – the inquiry has sketched the biographical, social, cultural, and intellectual settings in which they worked, considered how the study of Israel fit within the context of their other explorations of antiquity, and investigated both the theories and the practices that undergirded all of those pursuits. Parts one and two have probed in depth the reconstructions of the past as produced by Wellhausen and Gunkel but done so principally in parallel. Rather than continue such analysis, however, this chapter aims at integration, to trace in full the lines of continuity and discontinuity across these two crucial moments at the turn of the twentieth century. By way of a critical tactic reminiscent of ping-pong, perhaps, the assessment seeks to demonstrate an underlying unity discernible in their scholarship through a juxtaposition of the implicit in Wellhausen, on the one hand, and the explicit in Gunkel, on the other – a unity apparent despite the real disunities displayed in this book thus far, asserted by the men themselves, and suggested by many of their interpreters. Shifting the light of critical analysis back and forth upon them should cast each in stark relief and yet illuminate the larger conceptual stone from which the two were carved.

Built into the very epistemological structures of their historiography, specifically liberal Protestant systems of creating knowledge directed both of them as they undertook the history of ancient Israel – structures coded as a neutral scientific inquiry and evident in reconstructions even still today. Wellhausen and Gunkel identified the history of literature with the history of religion and equated those histories with the history of the people of Israel. They defended the

---

penned it on the back of correspondence from Budde, which bore the date April 15, 1920 (cf. ibid., 178); see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 81, cf. 323–34.

[2] Wellhausen to Harnack, December 13, 1910, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 567.

distinctiveness of Israel, the importance of the individual, and the supremacy of the Protestant faith. They affirmed, more fundamentally, the priority of (original) texts for accessing the past, the inherently subjective, inner nature of religion, the knowability of history itself, the ultimate meaningfulness of life past and present, and the hidden reality of divine revelation. To excavate such structures, this chapter first evaluates their shared conception of history. Next, it disentangles their understanding of religion itself. Finally, the inspection summarizes the larger contours of their historiography, highlighting the continuity beneath discontinuity. Peculiar understandings of history and religion were written into the historiographic enterprise in modern German scholarship: they became fully manifest when Wellhausen and Gunkel wrote on the ancient world.

7.1 Revelation in/as History

The past was not the same as history. While the past suggested things gone by – the peoples, places, and events filling that world of "back then," whether knowable or not – history often suggested them in all of their connection and, critically, in their continuation even on into the present. Consequently, these two lexemes were not everywhere coterminous. The step was short indeed between the understanding of such interconnection as intrinsically meaningful, lawful, and progressive – a conception typical of German historicist thought – and the perception of a metaphysical force, even a personal being, not only immanent within but also unifying all phenomena past, present, and future.

Gunkel himself articulated such a sense of history, one imbued with the spirit of Neo-Kantianism, however unreflected.[3] In his 1903 *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, he enjoined on all New Testament scholarship to emphasize "the task of attaining a spiritual comprehension of the eternal present that has developed from the eternal past."[4] This mission implied much more than mere empirical analysis of what had long since happened or even grander questions of causality, how the past inflected the present. Rather, Gunkel apprehended history as not only comprehensive, in its inclusion and unification of phenomena throughout space and time, but also teleological, in its purpose and necessity, working behind the material world. Concluding his investigation, which established syncretistic elements in early Christian religion, he endorsed and then expanded meditations previously offered by Otto Pfleiderer on the course of human history:

> If Christianity is therefore "recognized as the necessary product of development of the religious spirit of our species – to whose formation the entire history of the world aspires,

[3] Cf. Beiser, *The Genesis of Neo-Kantianism*, 255–82.
[4] Gunkel, "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament," 405.

in whose embodiment all spiritual proceeds from the Orient and Occident have found their realization and likewise cultivation and harmonization – then this is," so we say with Pfleiderer, "the most magnificent and most solid apology of Christianity imaginable [from the historical standpoint]." Then one sees it has been no coincidence if this belief has overcome the world and placed on stage a new epoch in the history of humanity but that a higher historical necessity has revealed itself (*sich offenbart*) therein.[5]

This perception of history as cumulative and cohesive permitted Gunkel to reconcile the documented borrowings from all kinds of other peoples in the development of Christianity – such diffusion being a field of study in which he himself gladly labored – with claims of a universal human existence culminating in the Christian faith. Gunkel attributed neither the coherence nor the sequence of events to chance, however. Instead, he believed a metaphysical force had bound it all together and directed it all the while.

Gunkel ultimately equated divine revelation with history itself. He addressed the matter most directly during the Babel–Bible Affair, where the trained theologian contrasted an allegedly outdated view of revelation – namely, supernaturalism – with that of modern academic (read: liberal Protestant) theology. Now, as Gunkel engaged the topic, he did acknowledge a perspectival shift, from the discipline of history (*Geschichtswissenschaft*) to "the standpoint of *religion*, of *faith*," but he clearly considered them as two views upon a single coin.[6] Gunkel went on to describe "a deeper understanding of revelation, according to which the divine and the human do not exist together in mere *external* relations, but are bound together *internally*. The history of revelation proceeds therefore, among men, according to the same psychological laws as govern other human events."[7] According to Gunkel's sense of history, the ups and downs of human affairs thus implied the deity, and, indeed, his comments were often consequent in this regard. He thus called Luther "a gift of God to the German nation."[8] Less flatteringly, he argued, "We do not expect that God will give the light of the gospel to Darkest Africa without the co-operation of Christendom, and still we render Him praise for every successful missionary effort."[9] In the same way history united all humanity and happenings, so too revelation collapsed with all existence and events. "But in the depth of this development," he wrote, "the eye of *faith* sees God, Who speaks to the soul, and Who reveals Himself to him

[5] Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 95–96, with the bracketed expansion coming from Gunkel himself. The English translation omitted the passage altogether.

[6] Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 47, italics in the English translation but not the German original.

[7] Ibid., 47–48, italics original in English but not the German; cf. also, idem, "What is Left of the Old Testament," 18–19.

[8] Gunkel, "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion," 536.

[9] Ibid.

who seeks Him with a whole heart."[10] Historical science and faith were thus not incompatible. The past was one; the divine was one; the past and divine activity were one. Revelation, for Gunkel, manifested itself through the course of events, especially the life of individuals. The historian in Gunkel retraced complex lines of relationship between, among, and within ancient Israel, early Judaism, formative Christianity, and any number of other religions; the theologian in him saw God as having drawn them in the first place.

This twofold view of history, in its continuity of past and present, became apparent, unsurprisingly, in Gunkel's discussion of his own religious tradition of Christianity and his own academic discipline of biblical scholarship. He reckoned Israel exceptional: "To this people God hath disclosed Himself! Here God was more closely and clearly known than anywhere else in the ancient Orient, until the time of Jesus Christ, our Lord!"[11] While this particular remark emerged amid his comments on history and faith, on science and theology, in the context of Israel's debt to Babylonia, similar statements filled his earlier work on Genesis as well. In fact, as early as 1895, he had portrayed the people of Israel as distinctive among the nations and indicative of the divine:

> The historical view cannot behold Gen 1, as our fathers had, as a monument of a special revelation that was, say, bestowed upon the first human. But the conviction remains unshakeable that the working (*Walten*) of the living God manifests itself in the development (*Werdegang*) of the Israelite religion; indisputable, the right and duty of the historian of religion to pronounce this conviction forcefully at every high point of history, where the prospect opens up in all directions. Gen 1 is such a high point, a milestone in the history of the world, a monument to the revelation of God in Israel.[12]

The high point was not the highest point, nor did such a milestone mark the journey's end. For Gunkel, Jesus still stood on the horizon. Moreover, the historical path of Israel did not prove straight or smooth. While the prophets signified a peak in divine revelation, the nation quickly declined after the kingdom's demise, through the migration and wanderings of body and soul alike.[13] The road of Israel then diverged, with one branch dead-ending in later Judaism, another ascending onward and upward to Jesus, who continued the path of prophecy and psalms.[14] Based upon this narrative, Gunkel was able to speak of "the Israelite-Christian religion."[15] So, too, he stated elsewhere, "Yet all the clearer, we hear the voice of God from the heights of this [sc. Israelite] religion, especially in the prophets, and

---

[10] Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 48, italics original in English but not the German.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, 118.

[13] Cf., inter alia, Gunkel, "Geschichte Vorderasiens zur Zeit der großen Propheten," in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, xix.

[14] Cf. Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany*, 199.

[15] Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 25; but cf., e. g., idem, "What Remains of the Old Testament," 33–36.

we catch sight of his workings in all these events. And we have also seen, though only from afar, the final summit of this history, that is Jesus, our Lord."[16] Now, exactly *why* Jesus stood atop all human religious phenomena and precisely *how* he scaled its pinnacle remained obscure in the end, although *that* he had to do so was a foregone conclusion. Gunkel did not articulate the criteria for his evaluation of religions past and present, nor did he detail the standards for ranking them. But the frame of reference was clear when he declared, in a different venue, "This is the religion on which we depend, from which we have ever to learn, on whose foundation our whole civilization is built; we are Israelites in religion even as we are Greeks in art and Romans in law."[17] The pronoun in this statement referred, at its most inclusive, to modern European Christians and, most basically, the German Protestant kind. The point of departure for judging the past was that very point of arrival towards which, he believed, all history had built.

Far less forthcoming than his junior colleague with these kinds of proclamations on the non-empirical, Wellhausen nonetheless betrayed a comparable conception of history: a purposive, unified whole. On one level, this understanding emerged in his preoccupations with the past. He suggested a regularity to the stages of human development, with primitive societies climbing the ladder of progress to higher forms of political organization, technological advancement, and cultural achievement. Bringing his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* to a close, this historian of ancient peoples sketched a progressive, orderly unfolding of state and society, law and economy, ideas and morality, as well as art and science. Even so, he sought to differentiate these ordinary, predictable spheres of the processual from that of the individual, which he hallowed. Indeed, the failure to observe this – for him, essential – distinction engendered Wellhausen's ire against Diels, who, he felt, had misrepresented his position on the human in history.[18] On yet another plane, throughout these transformations – from tribal enclaves to a monarchic state, from a national cult to a global faith, from particularism to universalism, and from the collective to the individual – Wellhausen discerned a guiding force at work in human happenings, one frequently evocative of a god in its effect.[19] In this same academic book on ancient history, he explicitly – and thus exceptionally – expressed the need to believe "that God stands behind the mechanism of the world, that he can act upon my soul to pull it up to himself and help it provide for its own self, that he is the cord of an invisible and eternal community of the spirits."[20] This sense of the divine, a silent actor on the stage

[16] Gunkel, "Das alte Testament im Licht der modernen Forschung," 76

[17] Gunkel, *Israel and Babylon*, 48.

[18] See pp. 162–64 supra.

[19] Testifying to the importance of this conceptual structure for Wellhausen, two figures who otherwise represent opposing interpretive camps for his historiography agree in this regard: cf. Pedersen, "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," 170–74; Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 206–29.

[20] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 37.

of history discernible to those who knew how to listen, hence endowed human existence, past and present, with special meaning and significance. Wellhausen may have communicated hardly any interest in things philosophical and mostly eschewed matters of metaphysics, but his own conception of history as comprehensive, comprehensible, and continual sounded in the historiography he wrote.

Wellhausen, like Gunkel, correlated divine revelation with history. Here again, straightforward statements on the matter were only few and far between; still, his own understanding seemed to shine through the cracks in his writing at times. First, some passages proved ambiguous in perspective. Wellhausen could comment on the ancient world equivocally, leaving the reader unsure as to whether his remarks pertained exclusively to the past or perhaps conveyed an affirmation of some universal truth. When he drew a portrait of prophecy in Israel, for instance, Wellhausen declared, "Not through letters but through the spirit did he [sc. Yahweh] reveal himself depending on the need and occasion of history. The prophets were the interpreters of the intentions he had with Israel. It is their contribution that history, not the past but the present one, was understood as the meaningful product of divine dealings."[21] Now, this assertion might have referred only to the image of history on display in the prophets of Israel, but such reference to letter and spirit, to history as continuous, and to divine operations in the course of events resonated with the historian's own beliefs. So, too, he wrote of Elijah, "To him first was it revealed that we have not in the various departments of nature a variety of forces worthy of our worship, but that there exists over all but one Holy One and one Mighty One, who reveals Himself not in nature but in law and righteousness in the world of man."[22] Even more so than in the previous quotation, Wellhausen appeared to draw a line of continuity between the past and the present, suggesting a knowledge inherited and still applicable. Secondly, apart from these apparent affirmations of past prophetic understandings, his own affinities seemed to surface negatively, in his judgement of Judaism. While the Protestant philologist admired the Israelite prophets for the sense of history he ascribed to them and which he himself shared, he dismissed the Jews for an ostensibly different conception. Wellhausen therefore argued, "A true idolatry of

[21] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 103; cf., e. g., idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 398. Cf. p. 149 supra.

[22] Wellhausen, "Israel," 462. Wellhausen displayed a special fondness for Elijah, as when he commented, "In solitary grandeur did this prophet tower conspicuously over his time; legend, and not history, could alone preserve the memory of his figure. There remains a vague impression that with him the development of Israel's conception of Jehovah entered upon a new stadium, rather than any data from which it can be ascertained wherein the contrast of the new with the old lay" (ibid.; cf. idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 73; idem, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 1.1, *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's*, 33). This affinity had appeared already long before: "In my early student days," he recounted, "I was attracted by the stories of Saul and David, Ahab and Elijah; the discourses of Amos and Isaiah laid strong hold on me, and I read myself well into the prophetic and historical books of the Old Testament" (idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 3).

the law prevailed. God himself studied the Torah in his hours of leisure and read in the Bible on the Sabbath – so the rabbis thought. They had no understanding of his work in history. Even the Maccabean Revolt forgot it and let the literature on it wither – only the Christian church has salvaged it."[23] As for a notion of history, what Wellhausen liked he saw in the prophets; what he disliked he saw in the rabbis. Yet the most direct articulation that he issued on the relationship between history and revelation came, thirdly, not in a work of historiography but rather a book review, when he assessed a published series of lectures by William Robertson Smith. Defending his friend against conservative detractors, he contended:

> If only one could understand why biblical criticism of the theology that has dominated since Schleiermacher's death could admit the pagan Porphyry was right with regard to the book of Daniel but regard the authenticity of the Mosaic law as *Noli me tangere* ("touch me not")! Without a doubt, this inconsistency can be explained as the relic of a perspective, essentially abandoned, according to which revelation is the opposite of historical development. With the best success, Smith seeks to demonstrate in the two introductory lectures that this is not the case.[24]

No matter how subtle or oblique, Wellhausen upheld this doctrine of liberal theology, where faith and science, revelation and history were not in contradiction. Instead, they told the same truth about existence. He thus imagined order, unity, and meaning in past and present alike – and a god behind that history.

Though the hood of this historiographic engine was lifted much higher circa 1900, the same intellectual machinery and, furthermore, the same theological fuels providing it with power had, in fact, long driven inquiries into the past. These epistemological workings went on full display especially for those pasts with high stakes for Christian history. Wellhausen, unlike Gunkel, considered the open, sustained discussion of such matters at best unnecessary and at worst unseemly. Gunkel, unlike Wellhausen, judged them imperative to articulate. Yet however much their methodological routes into the ancient world diverged from time to time, their epistemological transport was the same.

7.2 Religion Now and Then, Religion Theirs and Ours

This book has deployed the capacious word religion to provide analytical purchase on the historiography of ancient Israel in modern Germany, a domain of scholarship embossed with the theories and practices of German historicism

[23] Idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 284. Wellhausen reportedly did not deny the possibility of miracles but only their historical verifiability: see the letter of William Robertson Nicoll to his wife after a visit to Wellhausen in Maier, *William Robertson Smith*, 208–10.

[24] Julius Wellhausen, review of *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, by William Robertson Smith, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 6, no. 11 (1881): 250–51; cf. also Wellhausen to Smith, [October 1881,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 93, 95; see further Maier, *William Robertson Smith*, 187–93.

and Protestant theology. The polyvalent term has supplied leverage on multiple dimensions of the enterprise: (1) the sacred scriptures privileged as a source for reconstruction of the past, (2) the mapping of religious history onto the literary kind, (3) the collapse of the history of Israel with that of its religion, (4) the Protestant frames of reference that structured these historical studies, (5) the subjects selected for and subjected to critical inquiry, (6) the genealogies constructed between Israel and Christianity and between antiquity and modernity, (7) the cultural, political, and intellectual orientation of those who set lasting trends in the venture, (8) and both the political arrangements of the German Empire and the institutional setting of theological faculties that promoted certain figures who ultimately established and maintained specific ways of building knowledge, whether the methods of accessing the past or the modes of narrating it. Accordingly, this investigation has exploited the category of religion to interrogate how scholars not only performed but also themselves conceptualized their operations in such historiography and how, a century later, cultural and intellectual historians historicize them, their work, and their world.

As with their understandings of divine revelation and history, Wellhausen and Gunkel had in common an idea of what religion actually was. Perhaps expectedly by now, the latter was far more forthright in his understanding of both the category itself and its relationship to his study of the past. After all, Gunkel himself wrote, and wrote at length, on *Religionsgeschichte*. Deriving an adjective, he talked about a "religio-historical" school, method, view (*Betrachtung*), and even movement (*Bewegung*).[25] Moreover, he contributed to such undertakings as *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* and "Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher." Aside from designations made by Gunkel himself, the objects (if not objectives) of inquiry for his historiographical efforts in the pasts of Israel, Judaism, Christianity, and far beyond do converge with ventures undertaken in religious studies today – a field of critical analysis that might further scrutinize his context and pursuits in Protestant theology of nineteenth-century Germany. Wellhausen, by contrast, did not identify his corpus so explicitly with the history of religion, even if he oft alluded to such bearings, nor were his elaborations on the category all that elaborated, although his own understandings, again, did show through at times. When he introduced his (prolegomena to the) history of Israel, the philologist cast the volume as an investigation into the law of Moses, where he sought to determine whether it "constitutes the starting point for the history of ancient Israel or for the history of Judaism, i. e., of the sect that outlived

[25] Cf., inter alia, Gunkel, "Die Richtungen der alttestamentlichen Forschung"; idem, "Gedächtnisrede auf Wilhelm Bousset," esp. 146; idem, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, vi, etc.; idem, review of *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, by Reischle, 1109; idem, "Was will die 'religionsgeschichtliche' Bewegung?"

the people exterminated by the Assyrians and Chaldeans."[26] In a similar fashion, and in another set of prolegomena, Wellhausen aimed to explore "the history of Islam insofar as it converged with the history of the Arabs."[27] As with Gunkel, Wellhausen's explorations into the ancient world resonate with the contemporary study of religion, fragmented as it is across any number of research foci and faculties, departments and disciplines. He thus dissected canonical writings, unearthed the rudiments of cultic practice, traced ideas of the otherworldly as they had impacted political formations on earth, and tracked changes in tradition as subsequent generations had adapted ancient texts.

Wellhausen imagined religion and politics integral to each another in antiquity. Reviewing his wide range of contributions, in their eulogies Eißfeldt and Becker parted ways regarding which of these dimensions had dominated his oeuvre. While Becker explicated, "Even his research on the history of religion is, at least in the field of Islam, fully subordinate to the political point of view," Eißfeldt countered this assertion and explained, "for him, the principle issue is not political history but intellectual history (*Geistesgeschichte*) or more precisely: the history of religion; for in his fields intellectual history is the history of religion."[28] Eißfeldt observed the attraction exerted on Wellhausen by one phenomenon in particular: "how religious forces burst forth from the depths of being, shatter ancient cultic and cultural institutions, and then gradually consolidate into spiritual institutions," how existence, once fully integrated, comes to separate into profane and spiritual worlds. Muhammad, the prophets, and Jesus thus represented crucial moments of great religious force that faded into spiritual institutions. This discord between the reviews of the arabist and biblicist registered the real entanglement in the histories Wellhausen wrote, for, indeed, "the combination which attracted Wellhausen was that of religious and political forces, both in their collaboration and in their conflicts" – an interest perhaps most manifest in his examinations of factions or parties in Islam and Judaism.[29]

The orientalist focused on this combination at the nexus of the nation. When Wellhausen averred, "The religion and people of Israel belong together," he surely thought the same for the early Arabs, both to and from which he consistently drew comparisons.[30] He examined how religion had bound a people together, how a people had created political structures that culminated in a state, and how religious communities operated when detached from political systems, although

[26] Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, 1. This "sect" of the original 1878 edition Wellhausen changed to "religious communion" (*der religiösen Gemeinde*) for the second, of 1883, only to alter it again (to *Religionsgemeinde*) with the third, of 1886.

[27] Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 6.1, *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams*, 3.

[28] Eißfeldt, "Julius Wellhausen," 70; Becker, "Julius Wellhausen," 98.

[29] Momigliano, "Religious History Without Frontiers," 53. See Wellhausen, D*ie religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam*; idem, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer.*

[30] Wellhausen, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 1.

the good liberal in him saw the individual as the prime mover in matters of religion. However much Wellhausen restricted his efforts to the realm of the ancient, the Semitic, or the primitive, he ultimately conceptualized a correspondence across humanity. In a lecture devoted to the Kaiser, he declared, "From similar beginnings, as those in which the Arabs in the desert have stood still, did the European polities also proceed, as many vestiges reveal," whereupon this privy government councillor quoted Virgil with *quantae molis erat romanam condere gentem* ("So great a toil it was to found the race of Rome").[31] No matter how implicitly, the elementary forms of social life – be they reflected in the ancient, the primitive, or the Semitic – gave the historian purchase on human history more generally, especially the intricate intertwining of nation, religion, and politics. Indeed, the bond of people and religion was the muse that sang to him.

Despite his study of religions from Israel through Judaism and Christianity to Islam, of religious texts, of religious institutions, and of religion in society, Wellhausen disclosed in his private correspondence an aversion to explorations of religion too far outside the standard domain of nation and politics. Already in 1896, during preparation for the second edition of *Reste arabischen Heidentumes*, he expressed his boredom with the work, confessing faded "interest in these old gods and goddesses, specter and superstition and whatever else one calls religion."[32] Wellhausen admitted ignorance of newer research on the subject and thus appealed to Smith for further information on animism, totemism, demons, fetishes, and deities.[33] (Smith, of course, contributed far more to the comparison and sociology of religion in general and of Israelites and Arabs in particular.) Even if Wellhausen did ruminate – or, rather, speculate – on early Semitic religion, suggesting, for example, human sacrifice as "a religious vestige of cannibalism," he betrayed at times an outright hostility to the increasingly fashionable forms of comparative religion in his lifetime.[34] He criticized Stade's pursuit of animism in ancient Israel, avoided "this plague of the intellects" (*inge-*

[31] Wellhausen, *Ein Gemeinwesen ohne Obrigkeit*, 15–16. In his untranslated preface to the second edition of *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, of 1883, Wellhausen declared, "Classical philologists have expressed their approval to me in an especially spirited manner; to judge by K. D. Ilgen and Ph. Buttmann, the knowledge of Greek antiquity to some extent predisposes [one] to an understanding of the Old Testament, which I consider right" (idem, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, x). He penned a similar comment to Schwartz: "Everything, ancient and modern, is found together among the Hellenes; they supplied the paradigm for all of world history; they are remarkable people, and I always regret that I only take a nip at them and do not know them thoroughly. One cannot be an historian without knowing the Greek foundations. However, it would also be good if the Greek scholars concerned themselves somewhat with the other peoples, for instance, the Semites and especially the Hebrews, according to your own example. The tradition of [Joseph Justus] Scaliger must be resumed. One goes too far into raptures over the Germans and Indo-Germans" (Wellhausen to Schwartz, February 15, 1907, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 499–501, at 500; cf. also Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 422).

[32] Wellhausen to Ferdinand Justi, May 16, 1896, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 338–39, at 339.

[33] Wellhausen to Smith, [July 26, 1885,] in ibid., 182–83, at 182.

[34] Wellhausen to Nöldeke, July 11, 1902, in ibid., 399–400.

niorum pestis) in what he called the caper of comparative philology and religion (*Sprach- und Religionsvergleicherei*), and admitted a certain sympathy for one of his colleagues "although he does compare religions."[35] So, too, this captain of the old guard pathologized the so-called *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* and prognosticated, "The gentlemen proceed with a predilection for the whole. One must let them play themselves out, the bubble will surely burst soon."[36] True, he did consent to the necessity of comparison, in an essay from 1905; even then, he did so but halfheartedly and that same year expressed to Nöldeke how they both were "pachyderms" against all the rage of religious history bustling among their juniors.[37] Although Wellhausen had earlier acknowledged the appeal of and, to some extent, the need for *Religionsgeschichte* for understanding biblical texts, Old and New alike, writing *abusus non tollit usum* ("abuse does not abolish proper use"), for him the venture seemed too hasty.[38] Indeed, Wellhausen derided such endeavors in comparative mythology and in the roots of religion "as though there were nothing more to investigate in the documented past (*Historie*). It is a true pestilence of the mind (*pestilentia mentalis*)."[39] Whatever his interest in the histories of religions, he had little sympathy for the History of Religion.

[35] So, respectively, Wellhausen to Kuenen, [September 23, 1884,] in ibid., 153; Wellhausen to Kuenen, August 9, 1879, in ibid., 59–60, at 59; Wellhausen to Herrmann, January 1, 1913, in ibid., 597, the colleague in question being Arthur Titius (1864–1936). The comment on pestilence appeared as Wellhausen mentioned his own review of a volume by the Jewish scholar Julius Popper (1823–1884); in that evaluation, he concluded, "What Popper achieved with this work is the complete discrediting of the so-ca[lled] comparative mythology in the area of the Old Testament": Julius Wellhausen, review of *Der Ursprung des Monotheismus. Eine historische Kritik des Hebräischen Alterthums, insbesondere der Offenbarungsgeschichte. Kritik der Patriarchengeschichte*, by Julius Popper, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 4, no. 26 (1879): 609–11, at 611.

[36] Wellhausen to Littmann, January 21, 1915, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 630. He critiqued Rudolf Otto for studying a religion through travel without knowing the relevant language and literature well enough.

[37] Wellhausen, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 1–2; Wellhausen to Nöldeke, October 18, 1905, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 466–67. The volume that featured his essay began to appear already in 1905, although the publication date stands as 1906.

[38] Wellhausen to Harnack, May 21, 1891, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 267.

[39] Wellhausen to Kuenen, [September 23, 1884,] in ibid., 153. This devotion to documentation discouraged him from reaching beyond the limits of his texts, however subjective the sense of those limits may have been. "We must restrain the thirst for knowledge of the historical Jesus," he declared. "We must be satisfied that a series of writings from the time of Christian origins (*Schöpfungszeit des Christentums*) are preserved at all, which are cut off from the later church literature by a dark chasm" (Julius Wellhausen, *Evangelienkommentare*, *Nachdruck von "Einleitung in die ersten drei Evangelien" 2. Aufl. 1911, "Das Evangelium Matthaei" 2. Aufl. 1914, "Das Evangelium Marci" 2. Aufl. 1909, "Das Evangelium Lucae" 1. Aufl. 1904, "Das Evangelium Johannis" 1. Aufl. 1908*, ed. with an introduction by Martin Hengel [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987], 170.) The critic cast similar shades of doubt upon the recoverability of Israel's patriarchs on account of dubious sources (idem, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, esp. 318–27; cf. idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 10). Of course, his insistence on Moses as the "author" of a "certain inner unity" among the Israelites arguably rested on almost equally thin basis of documentation (idem, "Israel," 433). Wellhausen seemed to believe a proper people, a nation, and a religion required a founding figure, and hence he looked for one; cf. pp. 88–92 above.

Surely one with such a predilection for the whole, Gunkel actually considered himself a direct descendent of Wellhausen as he pursued questions of comparative mythology and the origins of religion. Gunkel hailed the ascertainment of the Priestly Code's "actual character" – especially the relative lateness of its composition – to be "Wellhausen's immortal contribution" insofar as it had forced a reassessment of the Old Testament literature in its entirety, which then "prepared the field for vibrant, true, historical understanding of Israel's religious history."[40] Gunkel presupposed and reproduced the portrait of ancient Israel that was fresh for Old Testament scholarship as Wellhausen started his career but sufficiently dried and accepted by the time Gunkel went through his training in biblical studies. From the critical rearrangement of pentateuchal sources through the rewritten narrative of Israelite history to the task of literary history, Gunkel fully recognized the labors of his predecessors.[41] But even as he expressed appreciation for the pathfinders of his field, this representative of the 1890s generation believed the path, in fact, went further than they themselves were willing to go: he hoped to continue that journey, to blaze new trails through the Bible. In a move quite typical of radicals and innovators, Gunkel argued he himself was preserving the true legacy of biblical scholarship – considering his own cohort the legitimate representatives of the enterprise – and described the pioneers of the previous generation as having settled too early in the venture. Without apologies, he wrote an apologia for his study of religion. As usual, the paragon of a prior age proved to be a useful target. "Our first encounter was with the school of Wellhausen to which we ourselves had belonged, and whose great and imperishable work I have never been weary of praising," he first assured before assailing, "This school had concluded a dubious alliance between the History of Religion and Literary Criticism – an alliance in which, in our opinion, the former was not allowed its full rights."[42] Gunkel suggested again and again the time had come for the former kings of biblical scholarship to abdicate and expressed continued frustration at their attempts to thwart his claim to the throne.

Characteristically, Gunkel granted greater insight into his thinking on things religious in history. Now, he employed religion as a polyvalent term, suggesting, by turns, a universal phenomenon, a cultural expression, and an individual experience. He could thus remark on national religion, speak of its various forms (priestly and prophetic, cultic and ethical, higher and lower), and write about re-

[40] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., xciii, cf. lxxxi; see also idem, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen*, 1, 5.

[41] See Gunkel, "What Remains of the Old Testament," 18–19; idem, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 78–79; idem, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testamentes," 22; cf. also his section on the history of the ancient Near East, published in idem, "Einleitungen," in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*.

[42] Gunkel, "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion," 533; cf. esp. idem, "Wellhausen, Julius, und Wellhausensche Schule," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 1st ed.; idem, *Genesis*, 1st ed., xli.

ligions in the plural. This broad semantic cover permitted him to shift discussion with relative ease from primitive social groups through the institutions of ancient states up to conditions in modern Germany, which implied a continuity across them all thereby. Yet Gunkel also operated with a still more essentialized idea. In an essay on the endeavor of *Religionsgeschichte*, he articulated this abstract theoretical category together with the need for comparative study to apprehend its referent in full:

> Just as a man who knows only one language does not really know any language; just as he who studies the history of one state requires to know something of what the life of a state means; so it is our conviction that all religions constitute an essential unit, and that the student of religion of the Bible must needs (*sic*) know in addition something of Religion as such. As a matter of fact, therefore, Biblical study opens out at this point into the Universal History of Religion.[43]

Time and again, he insisted such an undertaking concerned itself not with the history of religions but with history of religion, specifically, the *biblical* religion: "a sublime task to understand this religion in its depth and breadth, to trace it through its winding course, to be present at the birth of its deepest thoughts."[44] Such a deep understanding, however, could only come through wide comparison, with material from far beyond the two covers of the Bible.

As the nineteenth century turned into the twentieth, the comparative enterprise regained its former strength, which had flagged amidst the anti-romantic age of high liberal historicism. With the comparison of data from primitive Semitic societies as a precedent – especially that of (pre-Islamic) Arabs, mustered as it had been by Wellhausen and Stade – Gunkel expanded the analysis into Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, and Hellenistic religions on the basis of borrowing. Despite their distance in time and place, Gunkel saw in the primeval myths of Babylonia and the Apocalypse of John, for instance, variations of but one and the same material: a world apart and yet (genetically) connected. This monogenetic inquiry, however, contrasted the previous correlations based upon ethnicity (Semites), antiquity (ancients), or primitivity (cultural stages).[45] Gunkel's program for a history of religion thus entailed two distinct dimensions: namely, diffusion and morphology. Here again, his concept of history, with its strong idealist inflection, bound together all phenomena in general and every religious manifestation in particular. In one of his most telling declarations, the neo-romantic sketched this rationale:

> … religion, also the biblical religion, like everything else human, has its history. The life of humankind is history; that is, it is a tremendous living thing, a great unity, a vast cohesion,

[43] Gunkel, "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion," 535; cf. idem, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 123.

[44] Gunkel, "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion," 533; cf. idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, v–vii; idem, "Die Richtungen der alttestamentlichen Forschung," 66.

[45] Gunkel, "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion," 535; cf. idem, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 116.

in which everything is fruit and seed. And religion, too, is in this all embracing chain of cause and effect. Only from this cohesion can it be understood. […] Thus, we are filled with the enthralling notion of the world's endless breadth and abundance, where one type links a thousand connections (*wo ein Schlag tausend Verbindungen schlägt*).[46]

He also confessed these correspondences had drawn him further to the East, a personalized move that actually converged with a much larger intellectual (and political) movement in the German Empire. Even if he defended his comparative pursuits in the field of Old Testament scholarship, Gunkel ruminated little on the precise analytical justification for the procedure in each individual case, for his epistemological structure did not require any real distinction in the reason for juxtaposition. As a consequence of universal unity, he found a warrant for subpoenaing almost anything and everything into the court of historical explanation and of religious understanding.

This commitment to the history of religion notwithstanding, Gunkel ultimately stopped short of a full historicization. Instead, he stated research on other religions, past and present, would reveal the distinctive qualities of the "biblical religion" in the end, whether genetically, inasmuch as said biblical religion had infused its own special *Geist* into the borrowed materials, or analogically, insofar as independent comparative data could facilitate a better understanding of the very essence of religion, which, so Gunkel, reached its apotheosis in the biblical one. However, he seems neither to have anticipated the implications of his study nor to have accepted its full consequences. Especially as he aged, Gunkel equivocated on the parity of peoples: "This wealth of religious personality is the real greatness of the Hebrew religion. For this reason alone it is an insult to the historical spirit even to name Babylonians and Egyptians in one breath with Israel."[47] By the same token, he pronounced in the second edition of his dissertation, "All the history of religion, when pursued in a suitably comprehensive and wise fashion, will serve only to demonstrate the originality and marvelous grandeur of primitive Christianity, particularly of the gospel."[48] Even if such declarations sought to assuage the hesitance and hostility of those unsympathetic to his more promiscuous comparisons, Gunkel never betrayed a lack of loyalty to the doctrine of Christian supremacy. Precisely because the truth of Christianity lay beyond all doubt for him, its history could stand up to critical, comparative analysis.

Although Gunkel hoped to apprehend the fullness of religion by investigating its myriad manifestations, to grasp its very essence he aimed to explore not outward but rather inward, at inner personal experience. This quest took him to the subjectivity of religion. Indeed, he found – or rather placed – its locus in the individual. Reviewing *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, Wrede

[46] Gunkel, review of *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, by Reischle, 1109.

[47] Gunkel, "What Remains of the Old Testament," 52; see further Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 207–10.

[48] Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 4.

realized, already in 1896, "The principle matter seems to me: Gunkel has paved the way to a psychology of apocalyptic."[49] With his subsequent works he built a highway to that psychological dimension. This historian of literature may well have noted a gap between ancients and moderns and therefore stipulated only indirect access to the internal world of protagonists in the legends of Genesis – texts that described the actions, not thoughts, of their characters – yet he nonetheless affirmed the possibility of gaining entry to their "innermost heart," "inner soul life," and "spiritual life."[50] The avenue inward continued as Gunkel studied the prophets. Invoking the work of Duhm, who had cut a path into the realm of the irrational and the experiential, he reckoned ecstasy the "basic experience" (*Grunderlebnis*) of prophecy.[51] Whatever the distinctions he did draw within this institution and no matter the forms he did prefer, Gunkel believed prophetic experience fundamentally proceeded from "the same states," the same "spiritual processes," whose "actual locus has always been religion."[52] Although he reckoned ecstasy "a state of consciousness" quite difficult for moderns to appreciate, the *Religionsgeschichtler* affirmed its continued existence not only among other peoples and religions but also in his own German Empire and suggested a resemblance between many such experiences and mental or emotional illness.[53] While he further followed Duhm in stressing "double life" or "double consciousness" in this ecstatic experience – a division of the self allegedly implied in the dual use of "I" in certain biblical texts – Gunkel then led Emil Balla to emphasize the first person pronoun in the psalms as an indicator first and foremost of the individual, as opposed to a metonym for the community.[54] He held historical science had confirmed "that the epoch-making religious experiences have almost always appeared in this form, that the decisive religious personalities were for the most part pneumatic, and that the greatest epochs in religion were often pneumatic."[55] Religion was thus a radically inner affair.

---

[49] Wrede, review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Gunkel, 629.

[50] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., esp. xli–xlii.

[51] Gunkel, "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten," as repr. in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, xxi.

[52] Ibid., xxx; Gunkel, "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten," as repr. in idem, *Die Propheten*, 5.

[53] Gunkel, "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten," as repr. in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, xxi, xxvi–xxvii, xxxvi.

[54] See Gunkel, "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten," as first published in *Das Suchen der Zeit*, 142; idem, *Der Prophet Esra*, xviii–xxi, 100 n. 3; and further idem, "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten," as repr. in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, xx; idem, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 173–75; idem, "Der Micha-Schluß," 156; cf. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 1st ed. (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 3/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892). See also Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*; cf. Emil Balla, *Das Ich der Psalmen* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 16; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912).

[55] Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, 7.

When he described the essence of religion, however, Gunkel did not restrict it to the domain of the individual. Such experience was no mere sound and fury signifying nothing within a person's consciousness but connected to a greater reality. As with history itself, this historian identified religious experience of the person with revelation of the divine:

> To the student of history, all religion, including the Christian religion, is a phenomenon of the human mind. But the Christian believes in a Divine revelation. Wherever religion is experienced, it is experienced as an inward communion, a reciprocal converse between God and man, and the religious mind can never surrender this conviction. […] We are, however, firmly convinced that these two things – the insatiable hunger of the human heart after God and the ineradicable search after Truth – come from one and the same Divine source, and can therefore never contradict each other.[56]

In consequence, Gunkel pulled true religion outside the head of individuals and mapped it onto the cosmos. He also linked it to morality. The biblical scholar lauded "the high religious and moral superiority" of Israel over other peoples, as attested in the book of Genesis, and praised the prophets in particular – ecstatics who had become preachers, poets, and thinkers and ultimately "forged morality and religion as with an iron bond."[57] Yet Gunkel further credited these prophets with bequeathing the proper understanding of history, i. e., his own liberal Protestant one. Even entering the realm of a philosophy of history, they imparted "the powerful thought that history is a unity, a great divine-human activity."[58] Prophecy not only introduced an ethical code and provided insight into history, but it also embodied inner piety. As Gunkel closed his inquiry into hidden prophetic experience, he proclaimed "the pious, inspired person filled by God" to be "the most valuable thing God has created," before concluding, "We recognize divine revelation in the great, moved, pious persons and in the eternal thoughts whose carriers they became."[59] In this way, the historian of religion employed the past of Israel to validate a particular moral framework, a special concept of revelation, and a specific idea of religion as a private, internal affair.

This theoretical triad encompassing history, morality, and individuality underwrote Gunkel's project of literary history. Indeed, his program of interpretation targeted such inspired, pious persons past. Gunkel saw, and celebrated, an individualism allegedly cultivated in the prophets and psalms, atrophied in Judaism, and resurrected by Jesus and the early Christians. Interpreting songs of lament

---

[56] Gunkel, "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion," 535.

[57] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed., lxxxv; idem, "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten," as repr. in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, xxxiii. On the transition of prophesy, cf. also his essays "Die Propheten als Schriftsteller und Dichter," in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, and "Schriftstellerei und Formensprache der Propheten," in Gunkel, *Die Propheten*.

[58] Gunkel, "Die Propheten als Schriftsteller und Dichter," in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, lxix; cf. also Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 217.

[59] Gunkel, "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten," as repr. in Schmidt, *Die großen Propheten*, xxxvi.

in the Old Testament, he discerned a "piety of the heart, which stems from the religion of spirit and truth: the soul, liberated from cultic forms, stands before its God."[60] With this sense of true religion as a matter of the heart, he undertook interpretive efforts to encounter such individual piety expressed and preserved in biblical texts. A moment of union with these inspired persons constituted the goal of not only biblical studies but also the study of religion. Gunkel summarized this venture in a lecture delivered at the Fifth International Congress of Free Christianity and Progress:

> We know from the Pietists and from the teaching of German theology since Schleiermacher's day, that all religious teaching arises in the hearts of men and is only the expression of a far deeper feeling; that the actual well-spring, out of which religion eternally flows, is the heart of the pious man touched by God. Objective truth comes in the consciousness of humanity through persons, who have been mightily stirred and lifted above themselves. If then, we wish to understand religion in its innermost recesses, we must try to understand the inner life of good men. It is, therefore, the problem of Old Testament science to become acquainted, as intimately as possible, with those who best represent the religious atmosphere of the Old Testament. We must penetrate so deeply into their experiences that we can sympathise with them, that we can repeat them in ourselves, and become the interpreters of them to our own generation.[61]

Gunkel sought far more than some mere knowledge of the past. The modern historian of religion, studying the history of texts, was to become a repeater of ancient piety, a translator of experience. Yet the final objective lay beyond the realm of the human. Since these "pious men" had apprehended God, seizing them meant grasping him. Elsewhere, he portrayed the pursuits as follows:

> To listen in on, to catch sight of (*erkennen*) these towering figures, how also they have come to be in accordance with the mysterious order of God, which holds everything together and is in all diversity always the same: this true, intimate, historical understanding of the great persons of the religions, that is the crown of the "history of religion."[62]

In still a different article, he went so far as to equate these figures and their thoughts with divine revelation itself.[63] If Gunkel's history of literature facilitated his history of religion by granting access to inspired men of old, looking at them ultimately aimed at seeing God.

Just as Wellhausen and Gunkel shared the same conception of history and understanding of revelation, so also they held in common their notion of religion. While Gunkel's concentration on the interior world of individuals or

---

[60] Gunkel, "The Literature of Ancient Israel," 68.

[61] Gunkel, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," 119.

[62] Gunkel, review of *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, by Reischle, 1110.

[63] Hermann Gunkel, "Weissagung und Erfüllung," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung*, Vol. 5, *Roh–Zypressen*, 1st ed., ed. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1913), 1876–78, at 1877. This self-standing article did not appear in the second edition.

the relationship between religions and religion might appear as points of great divergence, the two actually converged on the very nature of religion itself. Now, Wellhausen had little interest in translating the thought and experience of figures from the ancient past in Israel for his own present in Imperial Germany, let alone identifying with them in some empathetic manner, yet he, too, visualized religion as a thoroughly inner affair, one that, in its highest form, carried ethical implications towards those outside the self. Since Wellhausen neither wrote on the programmatic level favored by his junior colleague nor engaged in such express rumination otherwise, the fractures in the texts he wrote provide the only glimpse into his own internal world.

Wellhausen detected an individualization of religion, which he largely ascribed to the prophets. In his reconstruction of early Israel, society had organized itself around the cult, with a deep identification of the people and their god, at least until the introduction of morality eroded the equation. Wellhausen's thesis "the nearer history is to its origin the more profane it is" proceeded from his conviction not in an absence of religion at the base of primitive society but in the lack of any distinction between the spheres of secular and religious.[64] The prophets broke that bond, doing so in several steps. Amos, herald of a distinctive class amongst the prophets, first disrupted such a felt relationship when he conceptualized a god of righteousness whose favor depended on deeds. As Wellhausen described the innovation,

> The ethical element destroyed the national character of the old religion. It still addressed itself, to be sure, more to the nation and to society at large than to the individual; it insisted less upon a pure heart than upon righteous institutions; but nevertheless the first step towards universalism had been accomplished, towards at once the general diffusion and the individualisation of religion.[65]

No longer as a matter of course did the life of the nation coincide with that of its god. Divine favor thus became contingent. For this reason, Wellhausen dubbed the prophets of Israel "the founders of the religion of the law, not the forerunners to the gospel."[66] Nonetheless, he prized the path to universalism and to individualization paved by the institution of prophecy, which had ultimately broadened Israel's patrimony beyond the people itself (i. e., to Gentiles) and narrowed religion to the private, personal domain. But another prophetic generation braved an even larger step. Once the northern kingdom had fallen and the southern one stood alone, "[t]he circumstances of the time themselves urged that the religion of Israel should divest itself of all politico-national character."[67] According to Wellhausen, Isaiah had championed this cause: "It was his most zealous endeav-

[64] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 245, cf. 123, 127, 422.
[65] Wellhausen, "Israel," 474; cf. pp. 101–06 above.
[66] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 110.
[67] Wellhausen, "Israel," 484.

our to hold king and people aloof from every patriotic movement; to him the true religious attitude was one of quietness and sitting still, non-intervention in political affairs, concentration on the problems of internal government."[68] With his notion of true Israel as a holy remnant – i. e., a small collective of pious individuals – Isaiah splintered the nation, which, in the end, allowed for the creation of a "church," that is, a religious community without an integral connection to a state. Yet Jeremiah, a "second Amos," then internalized religion even more. Wellhausen hence averred:

> With such men as Amos and Hosea the moral personality based upon an inner conviction burst through the limits of mere nationality; their mistake was in supposing that they could make their way of thinking the basis of a national life. Jeremiah saw through their mistake; the true Israel was narrowed to himself. […] But, instead of the nation, the heart and the individual conviction were to him the subject of religion.[69]

The demise of national religion – first by conditionality, then a curbed politicism, and finally inscription of divine law on the heart – created space for a personal one. As a result, the nature of religion at least seemed to change in the course of time. For this Protestant historian of the ancient world, religion only reached its height once it had plunged to its greatest depth: into the human heart. Wellhausen was certainly right when he confessed to Smith in private correspondence, "there is a certain danger for me in the study of the prophets since my sympathy for them makes me unfair and biased."[70]

This sympathy for what he perceived in the prophets also made him unfair and biased with respect to Judaism. Many of these criticisms issued from his own liberalism or, inversely, the lack of liberal values he discerned among the later Jews.[71] When Wellhausen historiographed his larger narrative, which stretched from primitive Semitic tribes through a nation of Israel and a Jewish community to a Christian church, such preferences stood in sharp relief.[72] While Moses reformed the cult and the prophets instated a set of ethics, the priests fabricated a strict and comprehensive system of morality. Crucially, Wellhausen believed a weak state had left a vacuum for the priests; once the kingdom had fallen to ashes, clerics could rise from the dust.[73] Yet he saw a continuity on either side

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid., 491.

[70] Wellhausen to Smith, May 1, 1889, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 226–27, at 227.

[71] So he wrote in one review, "He [sc. the author] is not especially pro-Jewish (*judenfreundlich*): however this cannot be attributed to a tendentious bias. The difficulties in writing a history of Judaism with a pro-Jewish inclination should not in fact be underestimated" (Julius Wellhausen, review of *Kulturgeschichte des Judentums von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*, by Otto Henne-Am Rhyn, *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* [*sic*] 2, no. 24 [1881]: 970–71, at 971).

[72] See especially, the sections "Die jüdische Frömmigkeit," "Die Ausbildung des Judaismus," and "Das Evangelium," in Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*; cf. "Judaism in Christianity," in idem, "Israel."

[73] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 420–21.

of the state's demise, contending the law had not intervened at once but "only gradually exerted its suffocating impact; it took a long time until the seed lignified behind the shell," that is, until Judaism finally "shriveled into Phariseeïsm."[74] Moreover, Wellhausen had an aversion to cultic practice already in the early days of Israel, before what he understood as Judaism had even come to be. "It is not asserted that the cultus before the law (of which the darker sides are known from Amos and Hosea) was better than the legal," he maintained, "but merely that it was more original; the standard of judgment being, not the moral element, but merely the idea, the primary meaning of worship."[75] With his affinity for things "original" and "natural," however, Wellhausen found this primitive cult more tolerable, for it ostensibly bore a close connection to a life lived on the land, when it still operated as "an exercise in piety" without any inherent value for the individual, before becoming "estranged from its own nature."[76] By contrast to an Israel filled with vibrant personalities, the Jewish religion, in his telling, "left no free scope for the individual."[77] After Ezekiel, on the other side of Ezra and Nehemiah, beyond Judah Maccabee, Judaism, in the narrative told by Wellhausen, continued to degenerate. As he imagined the fate of ancient Jews, they became a stateless, self-obsessed community of dubious nationality that not only fetishized religious law but also distorted the past by writing a history based on fanciful ideas. In the final judgment, he discerned in Judaism a religious sect loosed from the nation-state, a cult detached from nature, a supernaturalistic historiography severed from the actual past, and individuals consumed by law.

Those elements of Judaism so displeasing to the historian – elements he saw in its ancient past and wrote into his histories – had stemmed, Wellhausen believed, from (mis)conceptions of the divine.[78] Firstly, the deity demanded praxis, in his understanding of Judaism. Wellhausen condensed the Jewish faith into a single formula: "God helps the pious and destroys the wicked."[79] Now, he could, indeed, appreciate the individualized devotion perceived among the early Jews, in continuity with the prophets, for, as Deines has observed, "only the *legally regulated form* of Pharisaical piety contradicted his feeling for liberty the deepest, though no more than the churchly patronizing of piety in his day." Yet Wellhausen maintained such a personalized religion had ultimately become transactional over time.[80] Justice, as formerly preached by the prophets, had shed its social and forensic nature and turned, instead, into external stipulations of the law.[81]

[74] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 193; idem, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 38.
[75] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 79 n. 1.
[76] Ibid., 79 n. 1, 423, cf. 425.
[77] Ibid., 412.
[78] Cf. p. 60 n. 171 above.
[79] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 202.
[80] Deines, *Die Pharisäer*, 47 n. 22; cf., e. g., Wellhausen, "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," 38.
[81] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 200.

Such accretion of religious observation, he contended, had gone hand in hand with two dislikes of his: not only with speculation but also with dogmatism. In consequence, he claimed, this kind of religiosity had degenerated Judaism into a numb fanaticism, mindless and heartless by turn. Faith had become a fixation on the law, which "takes the soul out of religion and spoils morality," demanding "a service of God" he called "a self-chosen and unnatural one, the sense and use of which are apparent neither to the understanding nor the heart."[82] According to Wellhausen, then, the Jews had externalized religion, or, in his own description, "The occupation of the hands and the desire of the heart fall asunder."[83] To reapply John Hodgman, the deity had thus transformed into "a distant, uncaring dungeon master."[84] As a second, still more fundamental misconception in Judaism, in the view of Wellhausen, praxis could actually impact on the divine. The Jews' misunderstanding of observance had intersected, so Wellhausen, their misunderstanding of history. They had expected a *deus ex machina* – or rather, a deity beyond the normal course of history – to restore the Davidic kingdom to its former glory. In his assessment of Jewish thought, such a hope diverged from and even contrasted the "historical basis" that had undergirded the prophetic conception of history.[85] Whereas Amos "considers the fate of the entire people and in doing so, discerns between just and unjust as little as history does," Judaism had faltered insofar as "the contradiction between inner worth and outer faring (*Ergehn*) of the person unsettled the basis of the religion."[86] For this historian, the Jews of antiquity had lost a sense of history and piety.

As to be expected, Jesus represented the very best of religion for Wellhausen. If the law implied captivity, the gospel stood for liberty. Of course, the gospel according to Wellhausen first had to be recovered, for textual accretion had since concealed the earthly Jesus: "The more the tradition, the less the gospel. And the more the gospel, the less the tradition."[87] His most candid comments on law and gospel came in a chapter published multiply and titled, fittingly, "Judaism

[82] Wellhausen, "Israel," 509.

[83] Ibid.

[84] John Hodgman, speech delivered at the 2009 Annual Dinner of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Association, available online.

[85] Cf. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 195–96.

[86] Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 5, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 93; idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 203. Though noting some ambivalences, HaCohen thus concludes, "Wellhausen went against Christian tradition when he stripped the Israelites of the Law and attributed it instead to Judaism. But he adhered absolutely to both the negative Christian image of the Law and to the definition of the Law as the central, constitutive element of Judaism. The transfer of 'copyright' on the Law from Israelite culture to Judaism preserved the overall Christological image of history, and in fact strengthened the opposition between Judaism on one side and Israel and (Protestant) Christianity on the other" (idem, *Reclaiming the Hebrew Bible*, 132).

[87] Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis*, 121; cf. also idem, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1st ed., 113–15; 2nd ed., 167–70; see also Wellhausen to Harnack, June 29, 1900, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 387.

and Christianity," where he outlined the problems in the former that the latter had supposedly corrected. Jesus, in this telling, had pruned the overgrowth of Judaism back to a religion of the heart, represented among the ancient prophets and in the psalms. "The Gospel develops hidden impulses of the Old Testament," Wellhausen asserted, "but it is a protest against the ruling tendency of Judaism."[88] This development entailed three important movements: across the entire population rather than exclusion to elite religious groups, into the inner world of individuals, and towards the present instead of the future. One passage in particular expressed his own sense of said tendency and protest:

> Just this natural morality of self-surrender does He call the law of God; that supernatural morality which thinks to outbid this, He calls the commandment of men. Thus religion ceases to be an art which the Rabbis and Pharisees understand better than the unlearned people which know nothing of the law. The arrogance of the school fares ill at the hands of Jesus; He will know nothing of the partisanship of piety or of the separateness of the godly; He condemns the practices of judging a man's value before God. […] He is most distinctly opposed to Judaism in His view of the kingdom of heaven, not as merely the future reward of the worker, but as the present goal of effort, it being the supreme duty of man to help it realise itself on earth, from the individual outwards. Love is the means, and the community of love the end.[89]

Jesus, like the historian himself, had not only ridiculed the law but had also identified morality with self-abnegation. Indeed, Wellhausen hailed this self-denial "the chief demand of the Gospel."[90] (In his private correspondence, he even equated such self-sacrifice with *Wissenschaft* itself.[91] By the same token, he expressed concern over the sort of egotism that so often resulted from an extreme individualism, which threatened to pull society apart.[92]) Ethical life, through Jesus, had in consequence become natural and simple once again. If Wellhausen saw in Jeremiah "the bridge to personal piety" – i. e., "the transition from prophecy to religion in the sense that it means the mystery of the connection between God and human in the individual" – he perceived in the work of Jesus a culmination for this same subtle sense of the deity's work in human history, by means of the human heart: "The causal nexus which admits of being traced comes here to an end, and the mutual action, which cannot be analysed, between God and the soul begins. Miracle does not require to be understood, only to be believed, in order to take place."[93] Just as true religion, for Wellhausen, implied

[88] Wellhausen, "Israel," 509.
[89] Ibid., 510.
[90] Ibid.
[91] See Wellhausen to Dillmann, December 18, 1875, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 31–32; Wellhausen to Friedrich Spitta, October 8, 1885, in ibid., 185–86; cf. also Wellhausen to Smith, June 3, 1880, in ibid., 68–69.
[92] Cf., e. g., Wellhausen to Smith, March 19, 1892, in ibid., 281–82; Wellhausen to unknown, March 21, 1906, in ibid., 479.
[93] Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 208; idem, "Israel," 511.

an ethical life and personal piety, apart from any imposition by those outside the self, so also God himself had operated in the world not with sharp or sudden intervention from without but quietly, in the individual and behind the natural course of events.

Now, Wellhausen did ascribe much of the wrong in Christianity to its Jewish patrimony, and yet many of these criticisms actually proceeded less from his specific aversion to Judaism – real as it may have been – than a more general one to institutionalized religion, which he associated with the Catholic Church especially. The philologist concluded later Jewish authors had contorted the history of Israel within the biblical tradition, and he also argued Jewish corruption had distorted certain teachings of Jesus: "… for the rest the eschatology of the New Testament is so thoroughly saturated with the Jewish ideas of the disciples, that it is difficult to know what of it is genuine."[94] In contrast to this thesis of perversion, however, he contended other features of early Christianity had come simply through its heritage in Judaism. Wellhausen did claim, after all, "He [sc. Jesus] never thought of leaving the Jewish community. The Church is not His work, but an inheritance from Judaism to Christianity."[95] Counterintuitive perhaps, church, in this conception, meant "an unpolitical community on the basis of religion," "a religious community as their true fatherland."[96] Wellhausen maintained the church first presupposed a state. For this reason, he supposed the Christian religion would have had to have founded a state – as, indeed, Islam had done – if a civil order had not yet already existed, in the form of the Roman Empire. Similar to the word theocracy, however, he averred the original meaning of church had disappeared over time, as the state and Christian religion increasingly entangled and ultimately converged. "In this way it became much more difficult to define accurately the spheres of the state and the Church respectively," he wrote, "regarding the Church as an organisation, not as an invisible community of the faithful."[97] This sort of organization, he believed, posed a risk to that kind of community. Wellhausen claimed the (presumably modern) state had gradually expanded into areas once cultivated by the church, and such an institutionalization threatened to suffocate faith, a situation he discerned in the Jewish past: "The Church, at first a substitute for the nation which was wanting, is affected by the same evils incident to an artificial cultivation as meets us in Judaism. We cannot create for ourselves our sphere of life and action; better that it should be a natural one, given by God."[98] Although he considered the nation superior to the church as both a creation and a concern of God's and while Wellhausen judged the state, in its current form, less a spiritual than a political force, this historian of

[94] Wellhausen, "Israel," 512.
[95] Ibid.; cf. pp. 96–97 above.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid., 513.

ancient nations and onetime professor of theology did discern a task left for the church in the modern age: "of preparing an inner unity of practical conviction, and awakening a sentiment, first in small circles, that we belong to each other."[99] He finished this section on the history of Judaism and Christianity with a naked proclamation of his own Protestant faith: "The religious individualism of the Gospel is, and must remain for all time, the true salt of the earth. […] [A]n entirely supra-mundane faith lends courage for resultless self-sacrifice and resigned obedience on earth. We must succeed: *sursum corda!*"[100] Such a statement broke the fourth wall of his historiographic text.

These cracks in the published historical work of Wellhausen reflected similar sentiment expressed in his private correspondence. He reflected on the nature of religion most often, and most intimately, with Smith, his brother in philological arms. In a letter from 1882, Wellhausen confessed, "I previously had a similar view to your own on religion and its relationship to the individual and to the community; but I move away from that more and more each day. However, I don't want to talk about it; for me, my work is likewise growing over my head."[101] It was a movement, indeed. At this point, Smith had not yet delivered his watershed *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* or issued *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia,* but he had already published, inter alia, travel reports from the Middle East and an essay titled "Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament," all of which offered his own early meditations on totem, kin, and cultus at the base of Semitic society; he had also printed *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, a series of lectures that advanced similar lines of inquiry.[102] As recently as 1880, however, Wellhausen had commented on these articles and travel writings by Smith and actually affirmed not only that the type of communal feeling (*Gemeingefühl*) binding a tribe together was, in fact, "religious" in nature but also that many tribes had, indeed, derived their names from those of animals.[103] Yet in only two years or so, he seemed to grow uncomfortable

[99] Ibid. In his private correspondence, he could show a deep-seated skepticism towards the complete integration of political and religious institutions: "There is no other salvation (*Heil*) than in the radical separation of state and religion" (Wellhausen to Rudolf Smend, February 26, 1892, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 277–78, at 278; cf. Wellhausen to Adolf Harnack, [1907,] in ibid., 519–20; Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, [January 1886,] in ibid., 190–91).

[100] Wellhausen, "Israel," 513. Likewise, in a letter written to Harnack, Wellhausen affirmed a statement Kant had penned in correspondence of his own: "The essential element of the teaching of Christ is that he places the sum of all religion in being upright (*alio loco*: from the purest sincerity in view of the most concealed sentiment of the heart) in the belief that God will then supply the remaining good that is not in our power" (Wellhausen to Harnack, June 29, 1900, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 387, parentheses original).

[101] Wellhausen to Smith, [early 1882,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 96–97, at 97.

[102] On the connection of these travels and his sociology, see David N. Livingstone, "Oriental travel, Arabian kinship, and ritual sacrifice: William Robertson Smith and the fundamental institutions," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 22 (2004): 639–57.

[103] Wellhausen to Smith, June 3, 1880, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 68–69; cf. also his comment on Carlyle in Wellhausen to Smith, [October, 1881,] in ibid., 93, 95. Wellhausen himself would

with where this path might lead. In a different letter, likely from the summer of 1881, Wellhausen offered a hint as to what he was moving towards even as he was moving away from the stance of Smith, which had, at one time, been similar to his own. As he confessed to his confidant:

> Fortunately, I have figured one thing out: the goal and motive of piety can be nothing other than egoism – otherwise it is itself an illusion. Life, the preservation of life and the person, is in the Old and New Testament and in the nature of things the goal of piety. Naturally in the sense that whoever wants to preserve his life loses it and whoever lays it down for the sake of the gospel gains it. With Carlyle, this recedes much too far; he always only has the social in mind. Religion is, indeed, also what *unites* people; but the antecedent (*das Prius*), it seems to me, is the entirely personal and individual relationship to God. Nothing but obvious (*selbstverständlich*) things that have become difficult for me theoretically. Practically, this pious egoism, losing life to gain it, is of course that most difficult thing imaginable. Life certainly can be sacrificed, but damned inclinations (*Neigungen*).[104]

Both these scholars excavated deeply in the past of "primitive" Semitic society. Smith, of course, uncovered stones that would create the foundation for a sociology of religion, perhaps most of all with his claim that cult predated myth, that praxis preceded theory. Wellhausen, too, found the cult in general and sacrifice in particular at the very basis of such society, distinguishing cultic practice from "what we actually understand by [the term] religion."[105] As a matter of fact, Smith even credited Wellhausen as an inspiration for his own work on this front, although additional points of disagreement did emerge over the years, especially on theories anthropological, and such points then became all the more obvious after Smith had died and Wellhausen wrote more freely.[106] Nonetheless, by 1882, Smith had started his surveys in the sociology of religion, where he hinted the very bedrock comprised such elements as sacrifice, kinship, and totemism. Wellhausen's response, laconic and oblique as it was, seemed to stress the primacy not so much of a community but a collection of individuals – ones bound together by their commensurate personal religious experiences with a god. His was less the study of a human group than a group of persons. If the German could fault the Scot for his continued service at the altar of divine inspiration in the Bible and even of miracles, he himself refused to abandon the cult of the individual.[107]

---

continue to assert that a sense of community – also glossed as "piety" (*Pietät*) – had coalesced primitive peoples (Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 221; cf. idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 22–23). So, too, he once remarked to Harnack, speaking of the modern age, that one was actually born into religion, whether Judaism, Christianity, or Islam (Wellhausen to Harnack, [1907], in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 519–20).

[104] Wellhausen to Smith, [perhaps August/September 1881,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 89, italics original.

[105] Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 213–14, 221.

[106] See Rogerson, "Wellhausen and Robertson Smith as Sociologists of early Arabia and ancient Israel."

[107] Maier, *William Robertson Smith*, 207–10; cf. Wellhausen to Smith, [October 1881,] in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 93, 95; see also John W. Rogerson, *The Bible and Criticism in Victorian*

Notwithstanding this (at least for Wellhausen) felt divergence in first principles, these two semitists betrayed the same fundamental understanding of religion, which became manifest in their inquiries into the distant past of Israelites and Arabs. Much of the same theological architecture sustaining Smith's conception of religion supported that of Wellhausen as well: the pivotal relationship between a god and the individual, the primacy of experience over creed, the aversion to intellectualism, and the communion won through sacrifice. Indeed, a critical judgment passed on Smith's conception of religion, in his work on the Bible as on anthropology, applies equally well to Wellhausen's: "the conviction that the relationship between God and humankind was the very essence of religion."[108] In his historiography, the early Semites – pagan Arabs and ancient Israelites alike – suggested, already at the supposed bedrock of human society, features central to Christian thought. Writing on the pre-Islamic Arabs, Wellhausen proclaimed, "Blood is the glue of the most intimate fraternization," pronounced, "communion with God meant those who communed were also bound together," and propounded, for the ventures of Muhammad, "the piety of the heart still kept its place."[109] Key components of his own Christian faith were primal and primordial. These reflections between the ancient and the modern, the primitive and the advanced, the pagan and the Christian created images of a still grander narrative implied in Wellhausen's writings. The historian affirmed a coherent – and a meaningful – history of human existence. He fashioned a genealogy of religion that constructed a sense of continuity by means of categorical shifts: from the ethnic (Semitic) through the national (Israelite/Judahite) via the ancestral (Jewish) to the spiritual (Christian). Crimson threads, colored by his Christian belief, weaved through his historiography, across boundaries of people and language, of time and place, of text and tradition. This convergence between Wellhausen and Smith in their representations of the forces that drove Semitic society betrayed less a disingenuous endeavor or cryptotheology *per se* than the kind of bourgeois Protestant values built into the very image – even study – of religion itself.

Wellhausen had a favorite parable, one that proves quite telling. Reproduced in the foreword to his first major work, on the textual criticism of Samuel, from 1871, and recast to present none other than Jesus himself in the last publication

---

Britain: Profiles of F. D. Maurice and William Robertson Smith (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 201; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 123–25.

[108] Marjorie Wheeler-Barclay, "Victorian Evangelicalism and the Sociology of Religion: The Career of William Robertson Smith," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 54, no. 1 (1993): 59–78, at 73; see also Margit Warburg, "William Robertson Smith and the Study of Religion," *Religion* 19 (1989): 41–61; Robert A. Segal, "William Robertson Smith: Sociologist or theologian?," *Religion* 38 (2008): 9–24; see further Robert Alun Jones, *The Secret of the Totem: Religion and Society from McLennan to Freud* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).

[109] Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 125, 128; idem, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 5.

of his life, the final edition of his Israelite and Jewish history, from 1914, the story tells of a sower who scatters seed upon the ground, not knowing how it grows, which the soil turns to grain.[110] Schwartz, too, observed his liking to this tale of the seed growing secretly.[111] Wellhausen saw God's work in history as quiet, beyond the total comprehension of the mortal. As Eißfeldt has discerned, he imagined Israel's prophets, Jesus, and Muhammad as powerful moments in human history, where elemental forces of religion had risen from the depths of individuals, shattered the older institutions of cult and culture, and gradually ossified into clerical institutions: in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, a volcano had erupted and covered a circle of followers before hardening into cold, solid forms.[112] Wellhausen hoped the spread of a personal piety would reignite those fires. This type of religious expression, however, targeted humanity, aiming at the deity only indirectly. Perlitt therefore emphasizes how Wellhausen elevated the individual over the institution and conceived of a God immanent in the world: "Just as Israel through the prophets was called to earthly deeds of justice and *thereby* Yahweh, so the individual is called by Jesus to service to the human and *thereby* service to the divine."[113] The historian, who equated the work of God with history itself, also correlated the divine and human spheres. The deity was immanent indeed. Wellhausen had no interest in the hasty irrigation, fertilizer, or even harvest of the church. He was mostly content to work in silence, trusting the seed of the gospel would grow on its own.

The lives and works of Wellhausen and Gunkel offer insight not only into revolutions in reading the Bible, transformations in writing the history of Israel, or developments in the comparative study of religions but also into the shifting boundaries of disciplines, the altering models of historiography, the varying priorities of academic inquiry, the modifying self-justification of scholarly subject areas, the moving values of scholarship, and the fluctuating cachet of cultural obsessions. These specialists in the ancient past personified a transition in two distinctive generations at the turn of the twentieth century. Juxtaposing Wellhausen and Gunkel – the men as well as their writings – highlights lines of continuity and those of discontinuity. Instead of stopping at the surface of those contours, however, by merely marking points of similitude or difference, this analysis has plunged into their depths, seeking to discover the nitty gritty of *how* and *why*, of *what* and *where* those contours came to be.

Julius Wellhausen and Hermann Gunkel wore the same spectacles as they looked at religion in history. From the orientalist's endeavors in formative Islam,

[110] Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, xiv; idem, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 358.

[111] Schwartz, "Julius Wellhausen," 48.

[112] Eißfeldt, "Julius Wellhausen," 70–71.

[113] Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen*, 235.

to the efforts by the self-proclaimed historian of religion in antique Egypt and Mesopotamia, through the expanse of their common investigations into ancient Israel, early Judaism, and primitive Christianity, they saw the very essence of religion as an interior, personal experience. This experience, when shared, could unify individuals into a community and, ultimately, generate institutions. Both men regarded Jesus as the true embodiment of religion's purest form, his teachings further implying ethical consequences towards those outside the self. They also discerned in their study of olden texts and reconstruction of human affairs the work of God in history – a history that stretched, with coherence, from the distant past to their own present in modern Germany. Neither Wellhausen nor Gunkel undertook much critical inspection of those glasses themselves, whether the historical contingencies of their manufacture or their epistemological prescriptions.

Yet each scholar conducted his research with a distinctive strength of focus. The elder philologist viewed religion as the very substratum of society itself, and he examined the human construction of institutional complexes upon it. As he deconstructed (often sacred) literature, taking apart supposed distortions of the past by interested parties and later generations, Wellhausen proceeded to reconstruct those formations in their courses. His unswerving concentration on the deep entanglement of religion and politics, of a people and their god, of a nation and the state was in one sense fixed quite near, at the level of written texts, but in another rather far, firm as it was upon the distant past. Gunkel's gaze, by contrast, was relatively further, insofar as he essayed to reach beyond and behind the world of texts, and yet comparatively closer, inasmuch as he tried to consider its importance for the present. As opposed to the place of religion in the formation of society, creation of a nation, inception of a state, or contestation of political factions, he probed it as a universal human phenomenon, which then justified comparison of its many manifestations. In the same way, the young comparativist traced the metamorphosis of a single moment of religious experience across time, beyond language, over geography, and through instantiations, as later interpreters invested that original moment with new meaning.

What rendered the latent in Wellhausen so manifest in Gunkel was – beyond their own differences in disposition, predilection, and personality – a sense of modern crisis. The senior scholar promoted a philological positivism characteristic of the German human sciences in the mid nineteenth century, one that had prevailed, though not without real challenge, over other ways of building knowledge. Toiling in the mines of ancient texts, he did uphold a firm belief in the national spirits objectified in cultural productions and in the meaningfulness of past and present alike, and as he quarried deeper, the philologist perceived the workings of a deity in the unfolding of human events. Wellhausen was reticent, however, to articulate such convictions with much openness. Yet his academic labors, with their concern for the individual, their praise of the nation-state,

and their affirmation of Protestant hegemony in society as in science, not only implied but also advanced a specific set of values and commitments. The predominance in Prussia of his own Protestant structures – for doing, thinking, and being – and the dominance of Prussia within the German Empire helped create a sense of stability and consensus, relative to those first and those last decades of the nineteenth century, with respect to such assumptions. His general insulation through the privilege of class and status only bolstered this feeling of security.

In this regard, the junior academic differed sharply from his hero, with both consciousness and candor. He proudly voiced his inner convictions and drew bold lines from the past to the present. Indeed, Gunkel understood his scientific task not as merely knowing the work of God in history but as actively making that work known to the wider public. That history seemed all the more complex, the claims of a god behind it all the more complicated, with new discoveries of data and new innovations in method. The study of religion, he maintained, would reveal the divine in the human realm and thus deliver a means to renew the modern age, an age imperiled by the specter of socialist movements, the threat of commerce and industry to *Geist*, and the apparent ignorance among the bourgeoisie of a compatibility between science and the Christian faith. A perceived dissolution of consensus, a felt destabilization of society, and a perceived breakdown in traditional institutions thus propelled him to venture towards this end.

However much they differed – and differ they did indeed – the historiographic monuments built by Wellhausen and Gunkel shared the same conceptual foundation. Supporting their constructions were common theories concerning the development of texts, the nature of religion, the progress of society, the sources of the past, and even the workings of a god, theories both historically contingent and culturally conditioned. As the findings of these two German scholars were cemented into the very substructure of those modern disciplines to which they proved foundational – the study of ancient Israel, early Judaism, primitive Christianity, and formative Islam – so their theories, with their concomitant methods, were established in those structures, too. Many lie unexcavated still.

At the end of the day, for all their contributions to the compositional stages of biblical literature, to the historiography of Syria-Palestine, and to the study of religions, Julius Wellhausen and Hermann Gunkel lived and died the sons of northern German pastors, constituents of the bourgeoisie, and scholars trained in liberal theology. They upheld a conviction in the primacy of the Christian faith, the divine presence in human affairs, the trajectory of past and present, and the meaningfulness of history. The best of a non- (or proto-) Protestant past mirrored their own values for a German present. From the rudiments of society through inspired prophets of old to the figure of Jesus Christ, pure religion issued from inner experience with the divine, an immanent phenomenon no outside institution could impose. A proper Christian nation, state, or culture would have to constitute a community of pious individuals. What Wellhausen

and Gunkel located and praised in the ancient world was, ultimately, themselves: persons who saw the work of God in history and proclaimed a local ethic. The height of religion was the depth of the heart. For the historiography of ancient Israel circa 1900, the grass of high liberal historicism could wither, the flower of philhellenism fade, but the Protestant conception of religion and history stood firm: though, as the twentieth century wore on, not forever.

Bibliography

Adluri, Vishwa, and Joydeep Bagchee. *The Nay Science: A History of German Indology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Ahbel-Rappe, Sara. *Damascius' Problems & Solutions Concerning First Principles.* AAR Religion in Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Albright, William Foxwell. "The Ancient Near East and the Religion of Israel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 59, no. 2 (1940): 85–112.

–. "The War in Europe and the Future of Biblical Studies." In *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, edited by Harold R. Willoughby, 162–74. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Alles, Gregory D. "Toward a Genealogy of the Holy: Rudolf Otto and the Apologetics of Religion." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 69, no. 2 (2001): 323–41.

Anderson, J. G. C. *The Student's Gibbon: A History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Abridged from the Original Work by Sir William Smith D. C. L., LL.D.*, Vol. 2, *From A. D. 565 to the Capture of Constantinople by the Turks*. Rev. ed. London: Murray, 1901.

Asad, Talal. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

–. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reason of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Baird, William. *History of New Testament Research*, Vol. 2, *From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

Balla, Emil. *Das Ich der Psalmen.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 16. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912.

Balot, Ryan Krieger. *Greed and Injustice in Classical Athens.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Banks, Diane. *Writing the History of Israel*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 438. London: T&T Clark International, 2006.

Barstad, Hans M. "What Prophets Do. Reflections on Past Reality in the Book of Jeremiah." In *Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah,* edited by Hans M. Barstad and Reinhard G. Kratz, 10–32. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 388. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.

Barth, Roderich. "Innerlichkeit und Ausdruck. Aufgeklärte Frömmigkeit im Anschluß an Herder." In *Protestantismus – Aufklärung – Frömmigkeit. Historische, systematische und praktisch-theologische Zugänge*, edited by Andreas Kubik, 22–37. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Barton, George A. "On the Babylonian Origin of Plato's Nuptial Number." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 29 (1908): 210–19.

–. "Recent German Theories of Foreign Influences in the Bible." *The Biblical World* 31, no. 5 (1908): 336–47.

–. "The Astro-Mythological School of Biblical Interpretation." *The Biblical World* 31, no. 6 (1908): 433–44.

Barton, John. *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

–. "Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*: Influences and Effects." In *Text & Experience: Towards a Cultural Exegesis of the Bible*, edited by Daniel Smith-Christopher, 316–29. Biblical Seminar 35. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. Reprinted in *The Old Testament: Canon, Literature and Theology. Collected Essays of John Barton*, by John Barton, 169–79. Society for Old Testament Study Series. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007.

Baumgart, Max. *Wegweiser zur Erlangung akademischer Würden. Grundsätze und Bedingungen der Erteilung der Doktor- und Lizentiaten-Würde bei allen Universitäten und Hochschulen des Deutschen Reiches und der Universitäten und Hochschulen in der Schweiz und Österreich mit deutscher Unterrichtssprache*. 6th ed., edited by Ernst Lommatzsch and Karl Lommatzsch. Berlin: Decker, 1905.

Baumgarten, Marita. "Berufungswandel und Universitätssystem im 19. Jahrhundert. Die Universität Greifswald." In *Die Universität Greifswald und die deutsche Hochschullandschaft im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Werner Buchholz, 87–115. Pallas Athene 10. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004.

–. *Professoren und Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert. Zur Sozialgeschichte deutscher Geistes- und Naturwissenschaftler*. Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 121. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.

Baumgartner, Walter. "Alttestamentliche Einleitung und Literaturgeschichte." *Theologische Rundschau* n.s. 8 (1936): 179–222.

–. "Zum 100. Geburtstag von Hermann Gunkel." In *Congress Volume, Bonn 1962*, 1–18. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 9. Leiden: Brill, 1963. Reprinted in *Genesis*, by Hermann Gunkel. 6th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Vorlesungen über die christliche Dogmengeschichte*, edited by Ferdinand Friedrich Baur, Vol. 1, *Das Dogma der Alten Kirche*, Part 1, *Von der apostolischen Zeit bis zur Synode in Nicäa*. Leipzig: Fues (Reisland), 1865.

Baxter, William Lang. *Sanctuary and Sacrifice: A Reply to Wellhausen*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895.

Becker, Carl Heinrich. "Julius Wellhausen." *Der Islam* 9 (1919): 95–99.

Becker, Uwe. "'Die älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts'. J. G. Herders Auslegung der Urgeschichte und die Frage nach dem Spezifikum der israelitisch-jüdischen Religion." In *Gott und Mensch im Dialog. Festschrift für Otto Kaiser zum 80. Geburtstag*, edited by Markus Witte, 919–41. 2 vols. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 345/1–2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

Beiser, Frederick C. *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

–. *The Genesis of Neo-Kantianism, 1796–1880*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

–. *The German Historicist Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Benecke, Heinrich. *Wilhelm Vatke in seinem Leben und seinen Schriften*. Bonn: Strauß, 1883.

Benes, Tuska. *In Babel's Shadow: Language, Philology, and Nation in Nineteenth-Century Germany*. Kritik: German Literary Theory and Cultural Studies. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2008.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Antike und Christentum.* Gesammelte Aufsätze 4. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1998.

–. *Der Apostel Paulus in Rom*. Julius-Wellhausen-Vorlesung 4. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.

–. *Hellenismus und Urchristentum.* Gesammelte Aufsätze 1. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1990.

–. *Synoptische Studien*. Gesammelte Aufsätze 2. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1992.

Bleek, Friedrich. *Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, Vol. 1, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 3rd ed., edited by Adolf Kamphausen. Berlin: Reimer, 1870. 4th ed., edited by Julius Wellhausen. Berlin: Reimer, 1878. 5th ed., edited by Julius Wellhausen. Berlin: Reimer, 1886. 6th ed., edited by Julius Wellhausen. Berlin: Reimer, 1893. The second German edition was translated into English by G. H. Venables as *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, edited by Edmund Venables. 2 vols. London: Bell and Daldy, 1869. Reprinted London: Bell and Sons, 1882.

Blomfield, Alfred. *The Old Testament and the New Criticism*. Cheaper ed. London: Paternoster Row, 1895.

Bobzin, Hartmut. "Theodor Nöldekes Biographische Blätter aus dem Jahr 1917." In *"Sprich doch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch, wir verstehen es!": 60 Beiträge zur Semitistik, Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Werner Arnold and Hartmut Bobzin, 91–104. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002.

Boer, Roland T. Review of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel, with a reprint of the article "Israel" from the* Encyclopaedia Britannica, by Julius Wellhausen. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 124, no. 2 (2005): 349–54.

Böhl, Eduard. *Zum Gesetz und zum Zeugniss. Eine Abwehr wider die neu-kritische Schriftforschung im Alten Testament.* Vienna: Braumüller, 1883.

Bonner, Michael. *Jihad in Islamic History: Doctrines and Practice*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Boschwitz, Friedemann (Uri). *Julius Wellhausen. Motive und Maßstäbe seiner Geschichtsschreibung*. 1st ed. Berlin: Franz Linke, 1938. Reprinted as *Julius Wellhausen. Motive und Maß-Stäbe seiner Geschichtsschreibung*. Libelli 238. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968. Translated into Hebrew by Theodore Hatalgui as *Yulyus Ṿelha'uzen: yesodot u-ḳene midah ba-hisṭoryografyah shelo*. Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1982.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated from French by Richard Nice. Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903.

Boyd, Kelly, ed. *Encyclopedia of Historians & Historical Writing*. 2 vols. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1999.

Brandist, Craig. "Semantic palaeontology and the passage from myth to science and poetry: the work of Izrail' Frank-Kamentskij (1880–1937)." *Studies in Eastern European Thought* 63, no. 1 (2011): 43–61.

Bredenkamp, Conrad Justus. *Gesetz und Propheten. Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentlichen Kritik.* Erlangen: Deichert, 1881.

Brockelmann, Carl. *Lexicon Syriacum*, with a preface by Theodor Nöldeke. Edinburgh: T&T Clark/Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1895.

Brueggemann, Walter, and Hans Walter Wolff. *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.

Buss, Martin. *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 274. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
–. "Gunkel, Hermann." In *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, edited by Donald M. McKim, 487–91. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
–. *The Prophetic Word of Hosea: A Morphological Study*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 111. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969.
Bultmann, Christoph. *Die biblische Urgeschichte in der Aufklärung. Johann Gottfried Herders Interpretation der Genesis als Antwort auf die Religionskritik David Humes.* Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 110. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*. 5th ed. Aus der Welt der Religion, n.s. 1. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966.
–. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 29, n.s. 12. 1st ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921. 10th ed., with an afterword by Gerd Theißen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
–. "The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of Religion* 6, no. 4 (1926): 337–62.
Bunzl, Matti. "Franz Boas and the Humboldtian Tradition: From *Volksgeist* and *Nationalcharakter* to an Anthropological Concept of Culture." In *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, edited by George W. Stocking, Jr., 17–78. History of Anthropology 8. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.
Burckhardt, Jakob. *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*. 1st ed., edited by Jakob Oeri. 4 vols. Berlin: Spemann, [1898–1902]. Translated into English by Palmer Hilty as *History of Greek Culture*. 1st, abridged edition. New York: Ungar, [1963]. Translated into English by Sheila Stern as *The Greeks and Greek Civilization*, edited with an introduction by Oswyn Murray. 1st, abridged edition. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
–. *Weltgeschichtliche Betrachtungen*, edited by Jakob Oeri. 1st ed. Berlin: Spemann, 1905.
Cadbury, Henry J. "Proceedings, December, 1918." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 38, no. 3/4 (1919): i–xiii.
Calder, William M., III. "How Did Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff Read a Text?" *The Classical Journal* 86 (1991): 344–52.
–. "Three Unpublished Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 11, no. 2 (1970): 139–66.
–. "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: Sospitator Euripidis." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 27, no. 4 (1986): 409–30.
–. "Why Did Wilamowitz Leave Bonn? The New Evidence." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 130 (1987): 366–84.
–. "Wilamowitz to Zeller: Two Letters." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 19, no. 2 (1978): 177–84.
–, and Alexander Košenina. "Ein Heide im Gespräch mit einem Christen: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs Briefwechsel mit Adolf Jülicher." Reprinted in *Further Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff*, edited by William M. Calder, III, and prepared by Stephen Trzaskoma, 59–73. Hildesheim: Weidmann, 1994.
–, and Alexander Košenina, eds. *Berufungspolitik innerhalb der Altertumswissenschaft im wilhelminischen Preußen. Die Briefe Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs an Friedrich Althoff (1883–1908)*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1989.

Cancik, Hubert. "Overbeck, Franz Camill." In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, edited by the Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 19:724–25. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1999.

Chantepie de la Saussaye, Pierre Daniël. *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*. 2 vols. Freiburg: Mohr (Siebeck), 1887–89.

Chapman, Mark D. *Ernst Troeltsch and Liberal Theology: Religion and Cultural Synthesis in Wilhelmine Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1840.

Cheyne, Thomas Kelly. "Note on Gunkel's Schöpfung und Chaos." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 15, no. 1 (1895): 179.

–. "The Development of Israelite Prophecy." *The Academy* 8, n.s. 190 (December 25, 1875): 653–54.

–. "The Text of Job." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 9, no. 4 (1897): 573–80.

–. Review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel. *The Critical Review of Theological & Philosophical Literature* 5, no. 3 (1895): 256–66.

Clark, William. *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Claussen, Johann Hinrich. *Die Jesus-Deutung von Ernst Troeltsch im Kontext der liberalen Theologie*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 99. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Clemen, Carl. Review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 68 (1895): 619–30.

Clements, Ronald E. "Israel in its historical and cultural setting." In *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives. Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study*, edited by R. E. Clements, 3–16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

–. *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

Cohen, Hermann. "Julius Wellhausen. Ein Abschiedsgruß." *Neue Jüdische Monatshefte* 2 (1918): 178–81. Reprinted in *Hermann Cohens Jüdische Schriften*, Vol. 2, *Zur jüdischen Zeitgeschichte*, edited by Bruno Strauß, with an introduction by Franz Rosenzweig, 463–68. Veröffentlichungen der Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Berlin: Schwetschke & Sohn, 1924.

Cohn, Bernard S. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India.* Princeton Studies in Culture/Power/History. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Conrad, Ruth. *Lexikonpolitik. Die erste Auflage der RGG im Horizont protestantischer Lexikographie*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 97. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

Cooke, G. A. "Driver and Wellhausen." *Harvard Theological Review* 9, no. 3 (1916): 249–57.

Coyne, Ryan. *Heidegger's Confessions: The Remains of Saint Augustine in* Being and Time *& Beyond*. Religion and Postmodernism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Curtiss, Samuel Ives. *Primitive Semitic Religion Today: A Record of Researches, Discoveries and Studies in Syria, Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*, with an appendix by William Hayes Ward. Chicago: Revell, [1902]. Translated into German by H. Stocks as *Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients. Forschungen und Funde aus Syrien und Palästina*, with a foreword by Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903.

–. "Professor Julius Wellhausen and His Theory of the Pentateuch." *The Expositor* 14, 3rd Series, 3, no. 2 (1886): 81–98.

Dahl, Nils A. "Wellhausen on the New Testament." In *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, edited by Douglas A. Knight, 89–110. Semeia 25. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

Dalberg-Acton, John."German Schools of History." *The English Historical Review* 1, no. 1 (1886): 7–42.

Daude, Paul. *Die Rechtsverhältnisse der Privatdozenten. Zusammenstellung der an den Universitäten Deutschlands und Österreichs, sowie an den deutschsprachigen Universitäten der Schweiz über die rechtliche Stellung der Privatdozenten erlassenen Bestimmungen*. Berlin: Becker, 1896.

Davies, T. Witton. "August Dillmann 1." *The Expository Times* 6 (1895): 202–04.

–. "August Dillmann 2." *The Expository Times* 6 (1895): 248–50.

–. "August Dillmann 3." *The Expository Times* 6 (1895): 345–52.

–. *Heinrich Ewald, Orientalist and Theologian, 1803–1903: A Centenary Appreciation*. London: Unwin, 1903.

de Lagarde, Anna. *Paul de Lagarde. Erinnerungen aus seinem Leben für die Freunde zusammengestellt*. 1st ed. Göttingen: Kaestner, 1894. Reprinted as *Paul de Lagarde. Erinnerungen aus seinem Leben zusammengestellt*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1894. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Heims, 1918.

de Lagarde, Paul. *Deutsche Schriften*. 1st ed. Goettingen (*sic*): Dieterich, 1878.

–. "Mittheilungen über Paul Anton de Lagarde." In *Mittheilungen,* by Paul de Lagarde, Vol. 3., 34–41. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1889.

–. *Purim. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Religion.* Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 34. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1887.

–. *Ueber das verhältnis des deutschen staates zu theologie, kirche und religion. ein versuch nicht-theologen zu orientieren* (*sic*). Göttingen: Dieterich, 1873. Reprinted in *Deutsche Schriften*, by Paul de Lagarde, 5–54.

–. *Ueber die gegenwärtige lage des deutschen reichs. ein bericht* (*sic*). Göttingen: Dieterich, 1876. Reprinted in *Deutsche Schriften*, by Paul de Lagarde, 67–153.

–. "Ueber einige Berliner Theologen, und was von ihnen zu lernen ist." In *Mittheilungen*, by Paul de Lagarde, Vol. 4, 49–128. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1891. Printed separately as *Ueber einige Berliner Theologen und was von ihnen zu lernen ist.* Göttingen: Dieterich, 1890. Reprinted in *Erinnerungen an Friedrich Rückert. Ueber einige Berliner Theologen, und was von ihnen zu lernen ist. Zwei Aufsätze,* by Paul de Lagarde, edited by Anna de Lagarde. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1897.

De Valerio, Karolina. *Altes Testament und Judentum im Frühwerk Rudolf Bultmanns.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 71. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

de Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht. *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik in ihrer historischen Entwickelung dargestellt*, Vol. 1, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments, Oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judentums und Urchristenthums, Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen*. 1st ed. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1813.

Deines, Roland. *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 101. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Deißmann, Adolf. "Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus." *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für die Pädagogik*, Part 1, 11, no. 3 (1903): 161–77.

Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Wo lag das Paradies? Eine biblisch-assyriologische Studie.* Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1881.

Deuschle, Matthias A. *Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des kirchlichen Konservatismus im Preußen des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Deussen, Paul. *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen*, Vol. 1.1, *Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanischad's*. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1894.

Dieckmann, Detlef. *Segen für Isaak. Eine rezeptionsästhetische Auslegung von Gen 26 und Kotexten*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 329. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

Dieterich, Albrecht. *Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des spätern Altertums. Festschrift Hermann Usener zur Feier seiner 25jährigen Lehrtätigkeit an der Bonner Universität*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891.

–. *Kleine Schriften*, edited by Richard Wünsch. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911.

–. *Nekyia. Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1893.

–. *Prolegomena ad papyrum magicam Musei Lugdunensis Batavi.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1888.

Dieterich, Veit-Jakobus. *Religionslehrplan in Deutschland (1870–2000). Gegenstand und Konstruktion des evangelischen Religionsunterrichts im religionspädagogischen Diskurs und in den amtlichen Vorgaben*. Arbeiten zur Religionspädagogik 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Dieterici, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm. *Geschichtliche und statistische Nachrichten über die Universitäten im preußischen Staate*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1836.

Dillmann, August. *Genesis*. 6th ed. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1892. Translated into English by W. B. Stevenson as *Genesis, Critically and Exegetically Expounded*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897.

–. *Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie*, edited by Rudolf Kittel. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1895.

–. *Ueber die Theologie als Universitätswissenschaft. Rede beim Antritt des Rectorats der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin am 15. October 1875*. Berlin: Vogt, 1875.

–. *Von der Hochschule und den Hochschulen. Akademische Festrede zur Feier des hohen Geburtstagsfestes Seiner Königlichen Hoheit des Großherzogs Ludwigs III. am 9. Juni 1869*. Giessen: Pietsch, 1869.

Dilthey, Wilhelm. *Briefwechsel, 1852–1911*, Vol. 1, *1852–1882*, edited by Gudrun Kühne-Bertram and Hans-Ulrich Lessing. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.

Dobbs-Allsopp, Frederick William. *On Biblical Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Donner, Fred M. *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writing.* Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 14. Princeton: Darwin Press, 1998.

Dörrfuss, Ernst Michael. *Mose in den Chronikbüchern. Garant theokratischer Zukunftserwartung*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 219. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

Drescher, Hans-Georg. *Ernst Troeltsch: His Life and Work*. Translated from German by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1992.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890.

–. Review of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, by Julius Wellhausen. *The Academy* 28, no. 690 (July 25, 1885): 52–53.

du Bois-Reymond, Emil. "Culturgeschichte und Naturwissenschaft." *Deutsche Rundschau* 13 (1877): 214–50. Reprinted as *Culturgeschichte und Naturwissenschaft. Vortrag gehalten am 24. März 1877 im Verein für wissenschaftliche Vorlesungen zu Köln*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Veit & Comp., 1878. Reprinted in *Reden*, Vol. 1, *Litteratur, Philosophie, Zeitgeschichte*, by Emil du Bois-Reymond, 240–306. Leipzig: Veit & Comp., 1886.

Duchesne-Guillemin, J. *The Western Response to Zoroaster*. Ratanbai Katrak Lectures 1956. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jesaia*. 1st ed. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 3/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892.

–. *Die Psalmen*. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament 14. Freiburg: Mohr (Siebeck), 1899.

–. *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion dargestellt*. Bonn: Marcus, 1875.

Dundes, Alan. "Wet and Dry, the Evil Eye: An Essay in Indo-European and Semitic Worldview." In *Interpreting Folklore*, edited by Alan Dundes, 93–133. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980. Reprinted in *The Evil Eye: A Casebook*, edited by Alan Dundes, 257–312. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

Ebel, Wilhelm, ed. *Catalogus Professorum Gottingensium, 1734–1962*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

–. *Die Privilegien und ältesten Statuten der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.

Edgerton, Franklin. "Report of the Corresponding Secretary." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 39 (1919): 130–33.

Eisen, Ute E., and Erhard S. Gerstenberger, eds. *Hermann Gunkel revisited. Literar- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien*. Exegese in unserer Zeit 20. Berlin: LIT, 2010.

Eißfeldt, Otto. "Julius Wellhausen." *Internationale Monatschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 14 (1920): 193–208, 325–38. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, by Otto Eißfeldt, Vol. 1, edited by Rudolf Sellheim and Fritz Maass, 56–71. 6 Vols. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1962–79.

–. "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule." In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 4, *Mi–R*. 2nd ed., edited by Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack, 1898–1905. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1930.

–. "Sechs Jahrzehnte Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft." In *Volume du Congrès International pour l'étude de l'Ancien Testament, Genève 1966*, 1–13. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 15. Leiden: Brill, 1966.

Elrefaei, Aly. *Wellhausen and Kaufmann: Ancient Israel and Its Religious History in the Works of Julius Wellhausen and Yehezkel Kaufmann*. With a preface by Reinhard G. Kratz. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 490. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

Engberts, Christiaan. "Gossiping about the Buddha of Göttingen: Heinrich Ewald as an Unscholarly Persona." *History of the Humanities* 1, no. 2 (2016): 371–85.

Ericksen, Robert P. *Complicity in the Holocaust: Churches and Universities in Nazi Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

–. "Kontinuitäten konservativer Geschichtsschreibung am Seminar für Mittlere und Neuere Geschichte. Von der Weimarer Zeit über die nationalsozialistische Ära bis in die Bundesrepublik." In *Die Universität Göttingen unter dem Nationalsozialismus*, edited by Heinrich Becker, Hans-Joachim Dahms, and Cornelia Wegeler, 427–53. 2nd ed. Munich: Saur, 1998.

Erman, Wilhelm, and Ewald Horn, eds. *Bibliographie der deutschen Universitäten. Systematisch geordnetes Verzeichnis der bis Ende 1899 gedruckten Bücher und Aufsätze über das Deutsche Universitätswesen*, Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904.

Finsler, Rudolf. *Darstellung und Kritik der Ansicht Wellhausens von Geschichte und Religion des Alten Testamentes*. Zurich: Schulthess, 1887.

Flashar, Martin. "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1912): 81–116.

Foerster, Erich. *Adalbert Falk. Sein Leben und Wirken als Preußischer Kultusminister*. Gotha: Klotz, 1927.

Forster, Michael N. *After Herder: Philosophy of Language in the German Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Frank, Gustav. "Doctor theologiae." In *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, mit vielen protestantischen Theologen und Gelehrten,* Vol. 19, *Erster Supplement-Band*, 1st ed., edited by Johann Jakob Herzog, 423–26. Gotha: Besser, 1865.

Frei, Hans W. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Geiger, Abraham. *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen? Eine von der Königl. Preussischen Rheinuniversität gekrönte Preisschrift*. Bonn: Baaden, 1833. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Kaufmann, 1902. Reprinted Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1971 and, with a prolegomenon by Friedrich Niewöhner, Jüdische Geistesgeschichte 5. Berlin: Parerga, 2005. Translated from German by F. M. Young as *Judaism and Islam: A Prize Essay*. Madras: M. D. C. S. P. C. K. Press, 1898. Reprinted, with a prolegomenon by Moshe Pearlman, New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1970.

Geoghegan, Bernard Dionysius. "From Information Theory to French Theory: Jakobson, Lévi-Strauss, and the Cybernetic Apparatus." *Critical Theory* 38, no. 1 (2011): 96–126.

–. *From Information Theory to French Theory: A Media Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (working title). Forthcoming.

Gerdmar, Anders. *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann*. Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Gerstenberger, Erhard S. "Albert Eichhorn and Hermann Gunkel: The Emergence of a History of Religion School." In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, edited by Magne Sæbø, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, 454–71. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

–. "Social Sciences and Form-Criticism: Towards the Generative Force of Life-Settings." In *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*, edited by Timothy J. Sandoval and Carleen Mandolfo, 84–99. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 384. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.

Giesebrecht, Friedrich. Review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 157, no. 8 (1895): 585–602.

–. Review of *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1, no. 2. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 6, no. 19 (1881): 441–44.
Gold, Daniel. *Aesthetics and Analysis in Writing on Religion: Modern Fascinations.* Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003.
Gooch, George Peabody. *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*. 1st ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913.
Gooch, Todd A. *The Numinous and Modernity: An Interpretation of Rudolf Otto's Philosophy of Religion.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 293. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.
Gossman, Lionel. *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt: A Study in Unseasonable Ideas.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities. *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1903.* Göttingen: Dieterich, 1904.
Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities and University of Göttingen. *Nachrichten von der K*[*öniglichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität aus dem Jahre 1875*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1875.
–. *Nachrichten von der K*[*öniglichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität aus dem Jahre 1877*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1877.
Graf, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Der 'Systematiker' der 'Kleinen Göttinger Fakultät'. Ernst Troeltschs Promotionsthesen und ihr Göttinger Kontext." In *Untersuchungen zur Biographie und Werkgeschichte*, edited by Horst Renz and Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 235–90. 2nd ed. Troeltsch-Studien 1. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1985.
–. "Kulturprotestantismus. Zur Begriffsgeschichte einer theologiepolitischen Chiffre." *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 28 (1984): 214–68.
–. "Rettung der Persönlichkeit. Protestantische Theologie als Kulturwissenschaft des Christentums." In *Kultur und Kulturwissenschaften um 1900*[, Vol. 1,] *Krise der Moderne und Glaube an die Wissenschaft*, edited by Rüdiger vom Bruch, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, and Gangolf Hübinger, 103–31. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1989.
Gregory, Caspar René. *Wellhausen und Johannes*. Versuche und Entwürfe 3. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910.
Gregory, Frederick. *Nature Lost? Natural Science and the German Theological Tradition of the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
Greßmann, Hugo. *Albert Eichhorn und Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.
–. "de Lagarde, Paul Anton." In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung*, Vol. 3, *Heßhus–Lytton,* edited by Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack, 1919–22. 1st ed. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1912.
Gross, Michael B. *The War Against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany.* Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2004.
Gundlach, Franz. *Catalogus Professorum Academiae Marburgensis. Die akademischen Lehrer der Philipps-Universität in Marburg*, Vol. 1, *Von 1527 bis 1910*. Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hessen und Waldeck 15. Marburg: Elwert, 1927.
Gunkel, Hermann. "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen. Einige principielle Erörterungen." *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 42, no. 4, n.s. 7 (1899): 581–611.

–. *Ausgewählte Psalmen.* 4th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.
–. "Das Alte Testament im Licht der modernen Forschung." In *Beiträge zur Weiterentwicklung der christlichen Religion*, edited by Adolf Deissmann et al., 40–76. Munich: Lehmann, 1905.
–. *Das Märchen im Alten Testament*. 1st ed. Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher 2/23,26. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1917. Translated into English by Michael D. Rutter as *The Folktale in the Old Testament,* with introduction by John W. Rogerson. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1987. Reprinted Bloomsbury Academic Collections/Biblical Studies: Historic Texts. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
–. "Das vierte Buch Esra." In *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, edited by Emil Kautzsch, 2:331–401. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898–1900.
–. "Der Micha-Schluß. Zur Einführung in die literaturgeschichtliche Arbeit am Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 2 (1923): 146–78.
–. *Der Prophet Esra. (IV Esra.)*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1900.
–. "Der Prophet Esra, ein antiker jüdischer Religionsphilosoph." *Preußische Jahrbücher* 99 (1900): 498–519.
–. "Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten Israels. Eine religionspsychologische Studie." *Das Suchen der Zeit. Blätter deutscher Zukunft* 1 (1903): 112–53.
–. "Die Israelitische Literatur." In *Die orientalischen Literaturen, mit Einleitung. Die Anfänge der Literatur und die Literatur der primitiven Völker*, edited by Paul Hinneberg, 51–102. Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele 1/7. Berlin: Teubner, 1906. Translated into English by Armin Siedlecki as "The Literature of Ancient Israel." In *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*, edited by Timothy J. Sandoval and Carleen Mandolfo, 26–83. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 384. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.
–. *Die Propheten. Die geheimen Erfahrungen der Propheten, Die Politik der Propheten, Die Religion der Propheten, Schriftstellerei und Formensprache der Propheten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.
–. *Die Psalmen*. 4th ed. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 2/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926. Friedrich Baethgen had produced the first through third editions of this work, between 1892 and 1904.
–. "Die Religionsgeschichte und die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft." In *Fünfter Weltkongress für freies Christentum und religiösen Fortschritt, Berlin, 5. bis 10. August 1910. Protokoll der Verhandlungen*, edited by Max Fischer and Friedrich Michael Schiele, 169–80. Berlin-Schöneberg: Protestantischer Schriftenvertrieb, 1910. Translated into English as "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism." In *Fifth International Congress of Free Christianity and Religious Progress, Berlin, August 5–10, 1910: Proceedings and Papers*, edited by Charles W. Wendte, 114–25. London: Williams & Norgate, 1911.
–. *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen (Das erste Buch Mosis)*. 1st ed. Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, in Auswahl neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt 1/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.
–. *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus. Eine biblisch-theologische Studie*, 1st ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888. Reprinted, with a new preface and index, as *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und der Lehre des Apostels Paulus. Eine biblisch-theologische Studie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899. Translated into English by Roy A. Harrisville and

Philip A. Quanbeck, II, as *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
–. "Ein Notschrei aus Anlaß des Buches. Himmelsbild und Weltanschauung im Wandel der Zeiten. Von Troels-Lund, Leipzig, Teubner 1899." *Die Christliche Welt* 14 (1900): 58–61.
–, completed by Joachim Begrich. *Einleitung in die Psalmen. Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels*. 1st ed. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 2, Supplement Volume. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933. 4th ed., with an index by Walter Beyerlin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985. Translated into English by James D. Nogalski as *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998. The book's cover reads *An Introduction to the Psalms*.
–. *Elias, Jahve und Baal.* Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher 2/8. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1906.
–. "Formen der Hymnen." *Theologische Rundschau* 20, no. 10/11 (1917): 265–304.
–. "Gedächtnisrede auf Wilhelm Bousset, gehalten in der Universität Giessen am 9. Mai 1920." *Evangelische Freiheit* 20 (1920): 141–62.
–. *Genesis*. 1st ed. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 1/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901. Introduction published separately as *Die Sagen der Genesis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901. Introduction translated into English by W. H. Carruth as *The Legends of Genesis*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing, 1901. Reprinted as *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga & History*, with an introduction by William Foxwell Albright. New York: Schocken, 1964. Reprinted Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910. Translated into English by Mark E. Biddle as *Genesis*. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997. Introduction translated into English by John J. Scullion as *The Stories of Genesis*, edited by William R. Scott. Vallejo: BIBAL Press, 1994.
–. *Israel und Babylonien. Der Einfluss Babyloniens auf die israelitische Religion*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903. Translated into English by E. S. B. as *Israel and Babylon: The Influence of Babylon on the Religion of Israel [A Reply to Delitzsch]*. Philadelphia: McVey, 1904. Reprinted as *Israel and Babylon: The Babylonian Influence on Israelite Religion*, edited by K. C. Hanson. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2011.
–. "Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie. Ein Vortrag." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 42 (1924): 177–208.
–. *Reden und Aufsätze*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
–. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12, Mit Beiträgen von Heinrich Zimmern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895. Translated into English by K. William Whitney, Jr., as *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*, with a foreword by Peter Machinist. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
–. *The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction*. Translated into English by Thomas M. Horner, with a foreword by James Muilenburg. Facet Books Biblical Series 19. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
–. "Über die Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung." In *Festschrift zum 25jährigen Bestehen der Ferienkurse in Jena*, 70–80. Jena: Diederichs, 1913.
–. "Was will die 'religionsgeschichtliche' Bewegung?" *Deutsch-Evangelisch. Monatsblätter für den gesamten deutschen Protestantismus* 5, no. 7 (1914): 385–97. Translated into

English as "The 'Historical Movement' in the Study of Religion." *Expository Times* 38 (1927): 532–36.

–. *Water for a Thirsty Land: Israelite Literature and Religion*. Edited and translated into English by K. C. Hanson. Fortress Classics in Biblical Studies. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011.

–. *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*. Translated from German by A. K. Dallas. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

–. *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903. Translated into English by W. H. Carruth as "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament." *The Monist* 13, no. 3 (1903): 398–455.

–. Review of *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vol. 1, *Die Religion Israels und die Entstehung des Judentums*, by Bernhard Stade. Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften 1/1. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 27, no. 47 (1906): 2939–2943.

–. Review of *Das 4. Buch Esra, auf seine Quellen untersucht*, by Richard Kabisch. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 16 (1891): 5–11.

–. Review of *Die Apokryphen des A. T.'s, nebst einem Anhang über die Pseudepigraphenlitleratur* (*sic*), by Otto Zöckler. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 17, no. 2 (1892): 126–30.

–. Review of *Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes im Neuen Testament*, by Ernst Issel, *Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, by Otto Schmoller, and *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, by Johannes Weiss. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 18, no. 1 (1893): 39–45.

–. Review of *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, by Max Reischle. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 25, no. 18 (1904): 1100–1110.

–. Review of *Vorträge über die Offenbarung Gottes auf alttestamentlichem Boden*, by August Bender. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 17, no. 6 (1892): 155–58.

Guthe, Hermann. Review of *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Parts 1 & 2, 1881, by Bernhard Stade. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 8, no. 11 (1883): 241–45.

Gzella, Holger. Review of *Im Halbschatten. Der Orientalist Hellmut Ritter (1892–1971)*, by Josef van Ess. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 73, no. 3–4 (2016): 475–82.

Habermas, Rebekka. "Piety, Power, and Powerlessness: Religion and Religious Groups in Germany, 1870–1945." In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern German History*, edited by Helmut Walser Smith, 453–80. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

–. "Rituale des Gefühls. Die Frömmigkeit des protestantischen Bürgertums." In *Der bürgerliche Wertehimmel. Innenansichten des 19. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Manfred Hettling and Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, 169–91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

–. "Weibliche Religiosität—oder: Von der Fragilität bürgerlicher Identitäten." In *Wege zur Geschichte des Bürgertums. Vierzehn Beiträge*, edited by Klaus Tenfelde and Hans-Ulrich Wehler, 125–48. Bürgertum: Beiträge zur europäischen Gesellschaftsgeschichte 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

HaCohen, Ran. *Reclaiming the Hebrew Bible: German-Jewish Reception of Biblical Criticism*. Translated from Hebrew by Michelle Engel. Studia Judaica: Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums 56. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.

Hahn, Herbert F. *The Old Testament in Modern Research*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

–. "Wellhausen's Interpretation of Israel's Religious History: A Reappraisal of His Ruling Ideas." In *Essays on Jewish Life and Thought: Presented in Honor of Salo Wittmayer Baron*, edited by Joseph L. Blau, 299–308. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
Halpern, Baruch. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
Hammann, Konrad. *Hermann Gunkel. Eine Biographie.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
Hanhart, Robert. "Paul Anton de Lagarde und seine Kritik an der Theologie." In *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, edited by Bernd Moeller, 271–305. Göttinger Universitätsschriften A/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
Hanisch, Ludmila. *Die Nachfolger der Exegeten. Deutschsprachige Erforschung des Vorderen Orients in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003.
Harcourt, Bernard E. "On the American Paradox of *Laissez Faire* and Mass Incarceration." *Harvard Law Review* 125, no. 54 (2012): 54–68.
Hardy, Edmund. "Was ist Religionswissenschaft? Ein Beitrag zur Methodik der historischen Religionsforschung." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 1 (1898): 9–42.
–. "Zur Geschichte der vergleichenden Religionsforschung, 1–3." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 4 (1901): 45–66, 97–135, 193–228.
(von) Harnack, Adolf. *Das Wesen des Christentums. Sechzehn Vorlesungen vor Studierenden aller Fakultäten im Wintersemester 1899/1900 an der Universität gehalten*. 3rd ed., edited by Claus-Dieter Osthövener. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
Harper, William Rainey. "Editorial Notes. Wellhausen." *The Hebrew Student* 2, no. 1 (1882): 26–27.
Hartmann, Martin. Review of *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam*, by Julius Wellhausen. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 5, no. 3 (1902): 96–104.
Haug, Martin. *Die fünf Gâthâ's oder Sammlungen von Liedern und Sprüchen Zarathustra's, seiner Jünger und Nachfolger*. 2 vols. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 1/3, 2/2. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1858–1860.
–. *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsees*. 1st ed. Bombay: Bombay Gazette, 1862.
Hawting, Gerard R. *The First Dynasty of Islam: The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661–750*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2000.
–. *The Idea of Idolatry and the Emergence of Islam: From Polemic to History*. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Hayes, John H. *Interpreting Ancient Israelite History, Prophecy, and Law*, edited by Brad E. Kelle. Eugene: Cascade, 2013.
–, ed. *Old Testament Form Criticism*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974.
Heinrichs, Albert. "'Der Glaube der Hellenen'. Religionsgeschichte als Glaubensbekenntnis und Kulturkritik." In *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren*, edited by William M. Calder, III, Hellmut Flashar, and Theodor Lindken, 263–305. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985.
Hendel, Ronald, ed. *Reading Genesis: Ten Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
Hengel, Martin. *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 7, *Theologische, historische und biographische Skizzen*, edited by Claus-Jürgen Thornton. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neue Testament 253. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
Henze, Matthias. "4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: The Status Quaestionis." In *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, edited by Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini, 3–27. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 164. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

–. *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel.* Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
Herder, Johann Gottfried. *MAPAN. AΘA. [Maran. Atha.]. Das Buch von der Zukunft des Herrn, des Neuen Testaments Siegel*. Riga: Hartknoch, 1779.
–. *Philosophical Writings*. Translated into English and edited by Michael N. Forster. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
–. *Schriften zum Alten Testament*, edited by Rudolf Smend (Jr.). Bibliothek Deutscher Klassiker 93. Johann Gottfried Herder Werke 5. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1993.
Heschel, Susannah. *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
–. *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
–. "The German Theological Tradition." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, edited by Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton, 353–73. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.
Hesse, Jan-Otmar. "German University Professors' salaries in the 20th Century. A Relative Income Approach." *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte / Economic History Yearbook* 54, no. 1 (2013): 111–27.
Hilgenfeld, Adolf. "J. Wellhausen und die synoptischen Evangelien." *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 49 (1906): 193–238.
Hirsch, Emil G. "Wellhausen, Julius." In *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, edited by Isidore Singer, Vol. 12, *Talmud–Zweifel*, 501. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1906.
Hirsch, Felix E. "George Peabody Gooch." *Journal of Modern History* 26, no. 3 (1954): 260–71.
Hitzig, Ferdinand. Review of *De gentibus et familiis judaeis quae 1 Chr. 2.4 enumerantur*, by Julius Wellhausen, *De aetate carminum Dt. XXXII et XXXIII et quae inde sequantur ad circumscribendam Deuteronomii aetatem*, by Joannes Lehmann, and *De summa carminis Jobi sententia disputavit*, by Guilelmus Volck. *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur* 63, no. 56 (1870): 881–87.
Hjelde, Sigurd. "Die Geburt der Religionswissenschaften aus dem Geist der Protestantischen Theologie." In *Religion(en) deuten. Transformationen der Religionsforschung*, edited by Friedrich Wihelm Graf and Friedemann Voigt, 9–28. Troeltsch-Studien n.s. 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
–. *Die Religionswissenschaft und das Christentum. Eine historische Untersuchung über das Verhältnis von Religionswissenschaft und Theologie.* Studies in the History of Religion 61. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
–. *Man, Meaning, and Mystery: 100 Years of History of Religions in Norway. The Heritage of W. Brede Kristensen*. Numen Book Series/Studies in the History of Religions 87. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Hoffmann, Christhard. *Juden und Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*. Studies in Judaism in Modern Times 9. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
Hogan, Karina Martin. *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 130. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Hölscher, Lucian. "Bürgerliche Religiosität im protestantischen Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts." In *Religion und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by Wolfgang Schieder, 191–215. Industrielle Welt 54. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1993.

–. *Geschichte der protestantischen Frömmigkeit in Deutschland.* Munich: Beck, 2005.

Hourani, Albert. "Islam and the Philosophers of History." *Middle Eastern Studies* 3, no. 3 (1967): 206–68.

Howard, Thomas Albert. *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

–. *Religion and the Rise of Historicism: W. M. L. de Wette, Jacob Burckhardt, and the Theological Origins of Nineteenth-Century Historical Consciousness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Hübinger, Gangolf. *Kulturprotestantismus und Politik. Zum Verhältnis von Liberalismus und Protestantismus im wilhelminischen Deutschland.* Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.

Hupfeld, Hermann. *Die Psalmen*. 4 vols. Gotha: Perthes, 1855–62.

–. "Noch ein Wort über den Begriff der sogenannten biblischen Einleitung." *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 34, no. 1 (1861): 3–28.

–. *Ueber Begriff und Methode der sogenannten biblischen Einleitung nebst einer Uebersicht ihrer Geschichte und Literatur*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert's Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1844.

Iff, Markus. *Liberale Theologie in Jena. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte des ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts*. Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann 154. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Iggers, Georg G. "Historicism: The History and Meaning of the Term." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56, no. 1 (1995): 129–52.

–. *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*. Rev. ed. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.

Irwin, William A. "The Significance of Julius Wellhausen." *Journal of Bible and Religion* 12, no. 3 (1944): 160–73.

Jackson, Samuel Macauley. "Preface." In *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, edited by Philip Schaff, ix–xii. London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1908.

Jacob, Georg. *Altarabisches Beduinenleben nach den Quellen geschildert*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1897.

Jahn, Gustav. *Beiträge zur Beurtheilung der Septuaginta. Eine Würdigung Wellhausenscher Textkritik, mit einem Anhang "Antwort auf Pretorius' Allerneustes über meine Erklärung des Sibawaihi".* Kirchhain N-L: Schmersow, [1902].

Jahn, Otto. "Über den Aberglauben des bösen Blicks bei den Alten." *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Classe* 7 (1855): 28–110.

Janssen, Nittert. *Theologie fürs Volk. Der Einfluß der Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule auf die Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg.* Studien und Texte zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule 4. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999.

Jantsch, Johanna, ed. *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Adolf von Harnack und Martin Rade. Theologie auf dem öffentlichen Markt*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.

Janz, Oliver. *Bürger besonderer Art. Evangelische Pfarrer in Preußen, 1850–1914.* Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin 87. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

–. "Kirche, Staat und Bürgertum in Preußen. Pfarrhaus und Pfarrerschaft im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert." In *Evangelische Pfarrer. Zur sozialen und politischen Rolle einer bürgerlichen Gruppe in der deutschen Gesellschaft des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts*, edited

by Luise Schorn-Schütte and Walter Sparn, 128–47. Konfession und Gesellschaft 12. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1997.

Jastrow, Jr., Morris."Semitic Languages and Literatures." In *The American Yearbook: A Record of Events and Progress, 1919*, edited by Francis G. Wickware, 793. New York: Appleton, 1920.

–. "The Historical Study of Religions in Universities and Colleges." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 20 (1899): 317–25.

–. "The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis." *The Nation* 108, no. 2794 (January 18, 1919): 103.

–. *The Study of Religion*. London: Walter Scott, 1902.

Jepsen, Alfred. "Wellhausen in Greifswald. Ein Beitrag zur Biographie Julius Wellhausens." In *Festschrift zur 500-Jahrfeier der Universität Greifswald, 17.10.1956*. Greifswald: Verlag der Volksstimme, 1956. Reprinted in *Der Herr ist Gott*, by Alfred Jepsen, 241–70. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1978.

Jones, Robert Alun. *The Secret of the Totem: Religion and Society from McLennan to Freud*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Jordan, Louis Henry. *Comparative Religion: A Survey of Its Recent Literature,* Vol. 1, *1900–1909*. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1920.

–. *Comparative Religion: Its Adjuncts and Allies*. London: Oxford University Press, 1915.

–. *Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1905.

–. "The History of Religions, and its Introduction into the German Universities." *Expository Times* 22, no. 5 (1911): 198–201.

–. "The Study of the History of Religions in the German Universities." *Expository Times* 24, no. 3 (1912): 136–39.

Jülicher, Adolf. Review of *Das Evangelium Marci*, by Julius Wellhausen. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 29, no. 9 (1904): 256–61.

–. Review of *Das Evangelium Matthaei, Das Evangelium Lucae*, and *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, by Julius Wellhausen. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 30, no. 23 (1905): 615–21.

–. Review of *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, by Bernhard Stade. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 6, no. 8 (1885): 270–71.

Junginger, Horst. *Von der philologischen zur völkischen Religionswissenschaft. Das Fach Religionswissenschaft an der Universität Tübingen von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ende des Dritten Reiches*. Contubernium 51. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999.

Kany, Roland. "Hermann Usener as Historian of Religion." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 6 (2004): 159–76.

Karpp, Heinrich. "Lagardes Kritik an Kirche und Theologie." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 49 (1952): 367–85.

Kautzsch, Emil. "Bericht über die 1881 auf dem Gebiete der hebräischen Sprachkunde, alttestamentlichen Exegese und biblischen Theologie, sowie der Geschichte Israels erschienenen Bücher und Aufsätze." In *Wissenschaftlicher Jahresbericht über die Morgenländischen Studien im Jahre 1881*, edited by H. Kern et al., 60–107. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1885.

Kegel, Martin. *Away from Wellhausen: A Contribution to the New Orientation in Old Testament Study*. Translated from German by Marian Nolloth. London: Murray, 1924. Originally published as *Los von Wellhausen! Ein Beitrag zur Neuorientierung in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1923.

–. *Bruno Bauer und seine Theorien über die Entstehung des Christentums*. Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte 6. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1908.
Kelley, Donald R. "Horizons of Intellectual History: Retrospect, Circumspect, Prospect." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48, no. 1 (1987): 143–69.
–. "What is Happening to the History of Ideas?" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51, no. 1 (1990): 3–25.
Keßler, Martin, and Volker Leppin, eds. *Johann Gottfried Herder. Aspekte seines Lebenswerks.* Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 92. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.
Kidd, Colin. *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600–2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
Kirkpatrick, Patricia G. *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 62. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
Kirsten, Christa, ed. *Die Altertumswissenschaften an der Berliner Akademie. Wahlvorschläge zur Aufnahme von Mitgliedern von F. A. Wolf bis zu G. Rodenwaldt, 1799–1932.* Studien zur Geschichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR 5. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985.
Kitagawa, Joseph M. *The History of Religions: Understanding Human Experience.* American Academy of Religion Studies in Religion 47. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
Kittel, Rudolf. "Die Zukunft der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft. Vortrag auf dem Ersten Deutschen Orientalistentag in Leipzig (Sondertagung der Alttestamentlichen Forscher) am 29. Sept. 1921." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 39 (1921): 84–99.
–. "Die Zukunft der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft." *Die Christliche Welt* 36 (1922): 323–24.
–. *The Scientific Study of the Old Testament: Its Principal Results, and their Bearing upon Religious Instruction*. Translated from German by J. Caleb Hughes. London: Williams & Norgate, 1910. Originally published in German as *Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft in ihren wichtigsten Ergebnissen, mit Berücksichtigung des Religionsunterrichts*. 1st ed. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1910.
Klatt, Werner. "Ein Brief von Hermann Gunkel über Albert Eichhorn an Hugo Greßmann." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 66, no. 1 (1969): 1–6.
–. *Hermann Gunkel. Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 100. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
–. "Hermann Gunkel. Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode." Dr. theol. dissertation. University of Hamburg, 1966.
Klinge, Matti. "Teachers." In *A History of the University in Europe*, Vol. 3, *Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century (1800–1945)*, edited by Walter Rüegg, 123–61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Knight, Douglas A. *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel*. 3rd ed. Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
–, ed. *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel. Semeia 25. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
Koch, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm. *Die Preussischen Universitäten. Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen, welche die Verfassung und Verwaltung dieser Anstalten betreffen*, Vol. 1, *Die Verfassung der Universitäten im Allgemeinen*. Berlin: Mittler, 1839.
Koch, Klaus. *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese*. 1st ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964. Translated into English by S. M. Cupitt as *The*

Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method. Scribner Studies in Biblical Interpretation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

Kohl, Karl-Heinz. "Geschichte der Religionswissenschaft." In *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe*, Vol. 1, *Systematischer Teil*, edited by Hubert Cancik, Burkhard Gladigow, and Matthias Laubscher, 217–62. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1988.

Köhnken, Adolf. "Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker (1784–1868)." *Gymnasium* 97 (1990): 97–103.

Konkel, Michael. "'Die Theokratie als Idee und als Anstalt': Geschichte Israels und Judentum in der protestantischen Exegese des 19. Jahrhunderts." In *Die Konstruktion des Jüdischen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, edited by Michael Konkel, Alexandra Pontzen, and Henning Theißen, 69–85. Studien zu Judentum und Christentum. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003.

König, Eduard. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament, mit Einschluss der Apokryphen und der Pseudepigraphen Alten Testaments*. Bonn: Weber (Flittner), 1893.

–. *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*. 2 vols. in 3. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1881–97.

Kopp, Joseph. *Damasciou diadochou aporiae kai auseis peri ton proton archon. Damascii philosophi Platonici quaestiones de primis principiis ad finem*. Frankfurt: Broenneri, 1826.

Kramer, Samuel Noah. *The Sumerians: Their History, Culture, and Character.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Kratz, Reinhard G. "Die Entstehung des Judentums. Zur Kontroverse zwischen E. Meyer and J. Wellhausen." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 95, no. 2 (1998): 167–84. Reprinted in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels*, by Reinhard G. Kratz, 6–22. 1st ed. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 1/42. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

–. "Eyes and Spectacles: Wellhausen's Method of Higher Criticism." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 60, no. 2 (2009): 381–402. Published in German as "Augen und Brille: Wellhausens Methode der Höheren Kritik." In *Kleine Schriften*, by Reinhard Kratz, Vol. 3, *Mythos und Geschichte*, 87–103. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 102. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2015.

–. "Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918) und die Geschichte." In *Stiftsgeschichte(n). 250 Jahre Theologisches Stift der Universität Göttingen (1765–2015)*, edited by Bernd Schröder and Heiko Wojtkowiak, 105–16. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments.* 2nd ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

Kuenen, Abraham. "Critische bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van den Israëlietischen godsdienst. 5. De priesterlijke bestanddeelen van Pentateuch en Josua. Eerste Gedeelte." *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 4 (1870): 391–426.

–. "Critische bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van den Israëlietischen godsdienst. 9. Nog eens de priesterlijke bestanddeelen van Pentateuch en Jozua." *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 9 (1875): 512–36.

–. *Historisch-kritisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. 1st ed. Vol. 1, *Het ontstaan van de historische boeken des Ouden Verbonds.* Leiden: Engels, 1861. Vol. 2, *Het onstaan van de profetische boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. Leiden: Engels, 1863. Vol. 3, *Het ontstaan van de poëtische boeken des Ouden Verbonds. De Verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. Leiden: Engels, 1865. Translated into English, in part, and edited with notes by John William Colenso as *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*. London: Longman, Green,

Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865. [The half title reads *Critical Examination of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua*, which distinguishes this work titularly from that of Colenso himself, published in 7 parts between 1862 and 1879: cf. Fiona Bell, "Bibliography of Colenso's Work and Publications on Colenso," in *The Eye of the Storm: Bishop John William Colenso and the Crisis of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Jonathan A. Draper (Journals for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 386; London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 365–91.] 2nd ed. Published as *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. Vol. 1.1, *De Hexateuch.* Leiden: Engels, 1885. Vol. 1.2, *De historische boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. Leiden: Engels, 1887. Vol. 1.1–2. *De thora en de historische boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. Leiden: Engels & Son, 1887. Vol. 2, *De profetische boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. Leiden: Engels & Son, 1889. Vol. 3.1, *De poëtische boeken des Ouden Verbonds. De poëzie en de gnomische geschriften*, edited by Jan Carel Matthes. Amsterdam: van Looy, 1892. Translated, in part, into English, with the assistance of the author, by Philip Henry Wicksteed as *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua)*. London: Macmillan, 1886. Translated into German as *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des alten Testaments, hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung*. Vol. 1.1, *Die Entstehung des Hexateuch*. Translated into German by T. Weber. 1st installment. Leipzig: Schulze, 1885. 2nd installment. Leipzig: Schulze, 1887. Vol. 1.2, *Die historischen Bücher des alten Testaments*. Leipzig: Reisland, 1890. Vol. 2, *Die prophetischen Bücher*. Translated into German by C. T. Müller. Leipzig: Reisland, 1892. Vol. 3.1, *Die poetischen Bücher. Die Poesie und die gnomischen Schriften*. Translated into German by C. T. Müller. Leipzig: Reisland, 1894. Translated into French by Allard Pierson as *Histoire critique des livres de l'ancien testament*. Vol. 1, *Les livres historiques*, with an preface by Ernest Renan. Paris: Lévy Brothers, 1866. Vol. 2, *Les livres prophétiques*, with a preface by Ernest Renan. Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1879.

–. Review of *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, by Friedrich Bleek, edited by Julius Wellhausen. *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 12 (1878): 370–75.

–_Review of *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1, by Julius Wellhausen. Under the heading "Geschiedenis van Israël en van den Israëlietischen godsdienst." *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 13 (1879): 140–54

Kurtz, Paul Michael. "Axes of Inquiry: The Problem of Form and Time in Wellhausen and Gunkel." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 29, no. 2 (2015): 247–95.

–. "The Silence on the Land: Ancient Israel Versus Modern Palestine in Scientific Theology." In *Negotiating the Secular and the Religious in the German Empire: Transnational Approaches*, edited by Rebekka Habermas. New York: Berghahn Books, forthcoming 2019.

–. "The Way of War: Wellhausen, Israel, and Bellicose *Reiche*." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 127, no. 1 (2015): 1–19.

–. "Waiting at Nemi: Wellhausen, Gunkel, and the World behind Their Work." *Harvard Theological Review* 109, no. 4 (2016): 567–85.

La Vopa, Anthony J. *Fichte: The Self and the Calling of Philosophy, 1762–1799.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Landau-Tasseron, Ella. "Sayf Ibn 'Umar in Medieval and Modern Scholarship." *Der Islam* 67, no. 1 (1990): 1–26.

Langewiesche, Dieter. *Liberalismus in Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1988.

Lapidus, Ira M. *Islamic Societies to the Nineteenth Century: A Global History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Lasson, Adolf. "Mechanismus und Teleologie." *Verhandlungen der philosophischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 1 (1875): 1–44.
–. *Über den Zufall*. Philosophische Vorträge 18. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1918.
Lattke, Michael. *Paul Anton de Lagarde und das Judentum*. St. Lucia, 2014.
Leader, Zachary. *The Life of Saul Bellow: To Fame and Fortune, 1915–64*. New York: Knopf, 2015.
Legaspi, Michael C. *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies*. Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
Lehmann, Reinhard G. *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 133. Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
Lehmkühler, Karsten. *Kultus und Theologie. Dogmatik und Exegese in der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule*. Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie 76. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
Lenz, Max. *Rede zum Antritt des Rektorates der Königlichen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Berlin gehalten in der Aula am 15. Oktober 1911*. Berlin: Schade (Francke), 1911.
Lessing, Hans-Ulrich. "Heymann Steinthal: Linguistics with a Psychological Basis." In *Contributions to Comparative Indo-European, African and Chinese Linguistics: Max Müller and Steinthal*, edited by Joan Leopold. Prix Volney Essay Series 3. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.
Leuze, Reinhard. *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte. Der Weg Otto Pfleiderers*. Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, Münchener Monographien zur historischen und systematischen Geschichte 6. Munich: Kaiser, 1980.
Levenson, Jon D. *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism: Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
Liebeschütz, Hans. *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber*. Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 17. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1967.
Lincoln, Bruce. *Gods and Demons, Priests and Scholars: Critical Explorations in the History of Religions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
Littmann, Enno. *Arabische Beduinenerzählungen*. 2 vols. Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Straßburg 3. Strasbourg: Trübner, 1908.
–. "Erinnerung an Julius Wellhausen." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 106 (1956): 18–22.
Livingstone, David N. "Oriental travel, Arabian kinship, and ritual sacrifice: William Robertson Smith and the fundamental institutions." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 22 (2004): 639–57.
Loisy, Alfred. Review of *Das Evangelium Marci* and *Das Evangelium Matthaei*, by Julius Wellhausen. *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 25, no. 49 (1904): 382–88.
–. Review of *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* and *Das Evangelium Lucae*, by Julius Wellhausen. *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 27, no. 54 (1906): 441–52.
Lougee, Robert W. *Paul de Lagarde, 1827–1891: A Study of Radical Conservatism in Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
Lüdemann, Gerd. "Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule." In *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, edited by Bernd Moeller, 325–61. Göttinger Universitätsschriften A/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
–, ed. *Die "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule". Facetten eines theologischen Umbruchs*. Studien und Texte zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule 1. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1996.

–, and Martin Schröder, eds. *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen. Eine Dokumentation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

MacDill, David. *The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch: Defended against the Views and Arguments of Voltaire, Paine, Colenso, Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen*. Dayton: Schuey, 1896.

Machinist, Peter. "The Road Not Taken: Wellhausen and Assyriology." In *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded*, edited by Gershon Galil, Mark Geller, and Alan Millard, 469–531. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 130. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Machtan, Lothar. *Mut zur Moral. Aus der privaten Korrespondenz des Gesellschaftsreformers Theodor Lohmann*, Vol. 1, *1850–1883*. Bremen: Temmen, 1995.

Maier, Bernhard. *William Robertson Smith. His Life, his Work and his Times*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 1/67. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Mangold, Sabine. *Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft" – Die deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert*. Pallas Athene 11. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2004.

Marchand, Suzanne L. *Down From Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

–. "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism: Albrecht Dieterich, Richard Reitzenstein, and the Religious Turn in *Fin-de-Siècle* German Classical Studies." In *Out of Arcadia: Classics and Politics in Germany in the Age of Burckhardt, Nietzsche and Wilamowitz*, edited by Martin Ruehl and Ingo Gildenhard, 129–60. Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 79. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Studies, University of London, 2003.

–. *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship*. Publications of the German Historical Institute. Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute/ Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

–. "Philhellenism and the Furor Orientalis." *Modern Intellectual History* 1, no. 3 (2004): 331–58.

–. "Popularizing the Orient." *Intellectual History* 17, no. 2 (2007): 175–202.

–. "Priests among the Pygmies: Wilhelm Schmidt and the Counter-Reformation in Austrian Ethnology." In *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, edited by H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, 283–316. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

Marti, Karl. Review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel. *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 14 (1895): 481–83.

Masuzawa, Tomoko. *The Invention of World Religions or, How European Universalism was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Maus, Christian. *Der ordentliche Professor und sein Gehalt. Die Rechtsstellung der juristischen Ordinarien an den Universitäten Berlin und Bonn zwischen 1810 und 1945 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Einkommensverhältnisse*. Bonner Schriften zur Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte 4. Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2013.

Mauss, Marcel. Review of *Reste des Arabischen Heidentums* (*sic*) *(Vestiges du paganisme en Arabie*), 2nd ed., by Julius Wellhausen. *L'Année sociologique* 1 (1896–1897): 183–86.

McClelland, Charles E. "Öffentlicher Raum und politische Kultur." In *Geschichte der Universität unter den Linden*, Vol. 1, *Gründung und Blütezeit der Universität zu Berlin, 1810–1918*, edited by Charles McClelland and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, 567–637. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012.

–. *State, Society, and University in Germany, 1700–1914.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
–. *The German Experience of Professionalization: Modern Learned Professions and Their Organizations from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Hitler Era.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
Medlicott, W. N. "G. P. Gooch." *Journal of Contemporary History* 4, no. 1 (1969): 201–03.
Meinhold, Johannes. *Wellhausen*. Hefte zur "Christlichen Welt" 27. Leipzig: Mohr (Siebeck), 1897.
Merx, Adalbert. Review of *De profeten en de profetie onder Israël*, by Abraham Kuenen, and *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion dargestellt*, by Bernhard Duhm. *Jenaer Literaturzeitung* 3, no. 2 (1876): 17–20.
Meves, Uwe, ed. *Deutsche Philologie an den preußischen Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert. Dokumente zum Institutionalisierungsprozess*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
Meyer, Eduard. "Der babylonische Einfluß auf Judenthum und Christenthum. Ein Bericht über die Unterschungen H. Gunkels." *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* (Munich) 287 (December 13, 1894): 1–5.
–. *Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Eine historische Untersuchung.* Halle: Niemeyer, 1896.
–. *Julius Wellhausen und meine Schrift* Die Entstehung des Judenthums. *Eine Erwiderung.* Halle: Niemeyer, 1897.
–. Review of *Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, 1887, by Bernhard Stade. *Historische Zeitschrift* 61, no. 3 (1889): 461–64.
Miller, Jr., Patrick D. "Wellhausen and the History of Israel's Religion." In *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, edited by Douglas A. Knight, 61–73. Semeia 25. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983. Reprinted in *Israelite Religion and Biblical Theology: Collected Essays*, by Patrick D. Miller, 182–96. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 267. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
Moeller, Bernd, ed. *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*. Göttinger Universitätsschriften A/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
Molendijk, Arie. "Der Kampf um die Religion in der Wissenschaft." In *Religion(en) deuten. Transformationen der Religionsforschung*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Friedemann Voigt, 29–49. Troeltsch-Studien n.s. 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
–. *The Emergence of the Science of Religion in the Netherlands*. Numen Book Series/Studies in the History of Religions 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
–, and Peter Pels, eds. *Religion in the Making: The Emergence of the Sciences of Religion*. Numen Book Series/Studies in the History of Religions 80. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
Möller, Wilhelm. *Historisch-kritische Bedenken gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese von einem früheren Anhänger, den Studierenden der Theologie gewidmet*. With a foreword by Conrad von Orelli. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1899. Translated into English by Clarke Huston Irwin as *Are the Critics Right? Historical & Critical Considerations against the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis*, with an introduction by Carl von Orelli. New York: Revell, 1903.
Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Hermann Usener." *History and Theory* 21, no. 4, Beiheft 21: *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1982): 33–48.
–. "Introduction." *History and Theory* 21, no. 4, Beiheft 21: *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1982): 1–2.

–. "Religious History Without Frontiers: J. Wellhausen, U. Wilamowitz, and E. Schwartz." *History and Theory* 21, no. 4, Beiheft 21: *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1982): 49–62.
–. "The Rules of the Game in the Study of Ancient History." Translated from Italian by Kenneth W. Yu. *History and Theory* 55 (2016) [1975]: 39–45.
Moore, George Foot. Review of *Comparative Religion: Its Adjuncts and Allies*, by Louis Henry Jordan. *Harvard Theological Review* 19, no. 4 (1916): 431–33.
Morgan, Delmar, ed. *Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists*. 2 vols. London: Ballantyne, Hanson & Co., 1893.
Mousavi, Ali. *Persepolis: Discovery and Afterlife of a World Wonder*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.
Muilenburg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88, no. 1 (1969): 1–18. Reprinted in *Presidential Voices: The Society of Biblical Literature in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Harold W. Attridge and James C. VanderKam, 119–37. Society of Biblical Literature, Biblical Scholarship in North America 22. Atlanta: SBL 2006. Reprinted in *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism*, edited by Paul R. House, 49–69. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 2. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
Mürdter, Friedrich. *Kurzgefaßte Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens nach den Keilschriftdenkmälern, Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Alten Testaments*. 1st ed. Stuttgart: Bunder 1882. Second edition published as *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, edited by Friedrich Delitzsch. Reiche der Alten Welt 2. Calw: Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1891.
Myers, Perry. *German Visions of India, 1871–1918: Commandeering the Holy Ganges during the Kaiserreich*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
N. N. *Actes du sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes, tenu en 1883 à Leide.* 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1884.
–. *Actes du dixième Congrès International des Orientalistes. Session de Genève.* 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1897.
–. "Correspondenzen und Nachrichten." *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung für das evangelische Deutschland* 44 (October 30, 1869): 1055–57.
–. "Nachrichten." *Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland* 57, no. 33 (1906): 1157–58.
Nahkola, Aulikki. *Double Narratives in the Old Testament: The Foundations of Method in Biblical Criticism*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 290. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001.
Naumann, Otto. *Wellhausen's Methode, kritisch beleuchtet*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886.
Nestle, Eberhard. Review of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar*, Vol. 1, *Prolegomena*, by James Hope Moulton. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 26, no. 49 (1906): 1540–44.
Neugebauer, Wolfgang. "Wissenschaftsautonomie und universitäre Geschichtswissenschaft im Preußen des 19. Jahrhunderts." In *Die Berliner Universität im Kontext der deutschen Universitätslandschaft um 1800, um 1860 und um 1910*, edited by Rüdiger vom Bruch, in cooperation with Elisabeth Müller-Luckner, 129–48. Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 76. Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010.
Nipperdey, Thomas. *Deutsche Geschichte, 1800–1866. Bürgerwelt und starker Staat.* Munich: Beck, 1983.
Nöldeke, Theodor. Review of *De gentibus et familiis judaeis quae 1 Chr. 2.4 enumerantur*, by Julius Wellhausen. *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 21, no. 43 (1870): 1155–56.

–. Review of *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten,* Vol. 3, *Reste arabischen Heidenthumes* (*sic*), by Julius Wellhausen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 41 (1887): 707–26.

Norton, Robert Edward. *Secret Germany: Stefan George and His Circle*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated from German and with an introduction by Bernhard W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Nottmeier, Christian. *Adolf von Harnack und die deutsche Politik 1890–1930. Eine biographische Studie zum Verhältnis von Protestantismus, Wissenschaft und Politik.* 1st ed. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 124. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Nowak, Kurt, et al. *Adolf von Harnack. Christentum, Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft: Wissenschaftliches Symposium aus Anlaß des 150. Geburtstags.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

–. *Adolf von Harnack als Zeitgenosse. Reden und Schriften aus den Jahren des Kaiserreichs und der Weimarer Republik*, Vol. 1, *Der Theologe und Historiker.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.

O'Neill, John Cochrane. *The Bible's Authority: A Portrait Gallery of Thinkers From Lessing to Bultmann*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

Oberbreyer, Max. *Die Reform der Doctorpromotion. Statistische Beiträge*. 3rd ed. Eisenach: Bacmeister, 1878.

–. "Literatur zur Doktorfrage." *Zeitung für das höhere Unterrichtswesen* 5, no. 51 (December 21, 1876): 403–04.

Oden, Jr., Robert A. "Intellectual History and the Study of the Bible." In *The Future of Biblical Studies: The Hebrew Scriptures*, edited by R. E. Friedman and H. G. M. Williamson, 1–18. Semeia Studies. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

–. *The Bible Without Theology: The Theological Tradition and Alternatives to It*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987. Partially reprinted as "Historical Understanding and Understanding the Religion of Israel." In *Community, Identity, and Ideology: Social Science Approaches to the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Charles E. Carter and Carol L. Meyers, 201–29. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 6. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Oettli, Samuel. *Das 450jährige Jubiläum der Universität Greifswald am 3. und 4. August 1906*. Greifswald: Abel, 1906.

Orth, Jacques. "La centralisation du culte de Jéhovah." *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie* 4 (1859): 350–60.

–. *Les huit derniers chapitres d'Ézéchiel comparés au Pentateuque.* Strasbourg: Berger-Levrault, 1853.

–. "La tribu de Lévi et la Loi." *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie* 3 (1859): 384–400.

Osthövener, Claus-Dieter. "'Eine neue Flutwelle historischen Geistes'. Hermann Gunkel und Adolf von Harnack." In *Kontexte. Biografische und forschungsgeschichtliche Schnittpunkte der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft: Festschrift für Hans Jochen Boecker zum 80. Geburtstag,* edited by Thomas Wagner, Dieter Vieweger, and Kurt Erlemann, 131–56. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2008.

Otterspeer, Willem. "Introduction." In *Leiden Oriental Connections, 1850–1940*, edited by Willem Otterspeer, 1–6. Studies in the History of Leiden University 5. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

Otto, Eckart. *Max Webers Studien des Antiken Judentums. Historische Grundlegung einer Theorie der Moderne*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Otto, Rudolph. *Autobiographical and Social Essays*. Translated into English and edited by Gregory D. Alles. History of Religions in Translation 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.

Overbeck, Franz. *Ueber die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologie.* Leipzig: Naumann, 1903.

Oxford, Arnold Whitaker. *A Short Introduction to the History of Ancient Israel.* London: Unwin, 1887.

Paletschek, Sylvia. "Zur Geschichte der Habilitation der Universität Tübingen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Das Beispiel der Wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen (ehemals Staatswirtschaftlichen/Staatswissenschaftlichen) Fakultät." In *200 Jahre Wirtschafts- und Staatswissenschaften an der Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen. Leben und Werk der Professoren. Die Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät der Universität Tübingen und ihre Vorgänger (1817–2002)*, edited by Helmut Marcon, 1364–99. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004.

Paul, Herman J. "A Collapse of Trust: Reconceptualizing the Crisis of Historicism." *Journal of the Philosophy of History* 2 (2008): 63–82.

–. "Religion and the Crisis of Historicism: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives." *Journal of the Philosophy of History* 4 (2010): 172–94.

Paulsen, Henning. "Traditionsgeschichtliche Methode und religionsgeschichtliche Schule." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 75 (1978): 20–55.

Pedersen, Johannes. "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49 (1931): 161–81.

Penner, C. D. "G. P. Gooch as an Historian." *Historian* 3, no. 1 (1940): 97–112.

Penzler, Johannes, ed. *Die Reden Kaiser Wilhelms II. in den Jahren 1896–1900.* Leipzig: Reclam, n.d.

Perlitt, Lothar. "Hebraismus – Deuteronomismus – Judaismus." Reprinted in *Deuteronomium-Studien*, by Lothar Perlitt, 247–60. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 8. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.

–. "Heinrich Ewald: Der Gelehrte in der Politik." In *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, edited by Bernd Moeller, 157–212. Göttinger Universitätsschriften A/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

–. "Julius Wellhausen." In *Göttinger Gelehrte. Die Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen in Bildnissen und Würdigungen*. 2 vols., edited by Karl Arndt, Gerhard Gottschalk, and Rudolf Smend, 1:268. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001.

–. *Vatke und Wellhausen. Geschichtsphilosophische Voraussetzungen und historiographische Motive für die Darstellung der Religion und Geschichte Israels durch Wilhelm Vatke und Julius Wellhausen*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 94. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1965.

Pfleiderer, Otto. *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1902. Translated into English by W. Montgomery as *Primitive Christianity: Its Writings and Teachings in Their Historical Connections*. 4 vols. Theological Translation Library. London: Williams & Norgate, 1906–11.

–. *Religion und Religionen*. Munich: Lehmann, 1906. Translated into English by Daniel A. Huebsch as *Religion and Historic Faiths.* New York: Huebsch, 1907.

Plitt, Gustav Leopold. "Grade, akademische in der Theologie." In *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, unter Mitwirkung vieler protestantischer Theologen und Gelehrten,* Vol. 5, *Geist bis Herder*. 2nd ed., edited by Johann Jakob Herzog and Gustav Leopold Plitt, 342–51. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1879.

Pollock, Sheldon. "Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power beyond the Raj." In *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia*, edited by Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer, 76–133. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Preuschen, Erwin. Review of *Das Evangelium Marci* and *Das Evangelium Matthaei*, by Julius Wellhausen. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 25, no. 26 (1905): 821–86.

Procházka, Stephan. "Sprenger, Aloys Ignatz Christoph (1813–1893)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 51:986–87. 60 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Quidde, Ludwig. "Nachrichten und Notizen. Personalien." *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 3, no. 1 (1890): 268–69.

Rahlfs, Alfred. *Paul de Lagardes wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk im Rahmen einer Geschichte seines Lebens dargestellt*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 4/1. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1928.

Rehmann, Jan. *Max Weber: Modernisation as Passive Revolution, A Gramscian Analysis*. Translated from German by Max Henniger. Historical Materialism Book Series 78. Leiden: Brill, 2015. Originally published as *Max Weber. Modernisierung als passive Revolution: Kontextstudien zu Politik, Philosophie und Religion im Übergang zum Fordismus*. Berlin: Argument-Verlag, 1998.

Reid, Donald Malcolm. "Egyptology under Khedive Ismail: Mariette, al-Tahtawi, and Brugsch, 1850–82." In *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible*, edited by Steven W. Holloway, 139–85. Hebrew Bible Monographs 10. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007.

Reischle, Max. *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte. Fünf Vorlesungen gehalten auf dem Ferienkurs in Hannover im Oktober 1903*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1904.

Reland, Adriaan. *Antiquitates sacrae veterum hebraeorum*. 1st ed. Utrecht: Broedelet, 1708.

–. *Palaestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata*. 2 vols. Utrecht: Broedelet, 1714. Translated into Dutch as *Palestina opgeheldert. Ofte de Gelegentheyd van het Joodsche Land. Uyt de Gedenkstukken der Ouden getrokken en op vaster Gronden als voorheen aangetoont en beweezen*. With an obituary on the author by Joseph Serrurier. Utrecht: Broedelet, 1719.

Rendtorff, Rolf. "Die jüdische Bibel und ihre antijüdische Auslegung." In *Auschwitz – Krise der christlichen Theologie. Eine Vortragsreihe*, edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Ekkehard Stegemann, 99–116. Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog 10. Munich: Kaiser, 1980.

Renz, Horst, and Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, eds. *Untersuchungen zur Biographie und Werkgeschichte*. 2nd ed. Troeltsch-Studien 1. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1985.

Reusch, Franz Heinrich. "Messianische Weissagungen." *Theologisches Literaturblatt* 11, no. 17 (1876): 385–88.

Reventlow, Henning Graf. "Die Prophetie im Urteil Bernhard Duhms." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 85 (1988): 259–74.

–. *Epochen der Bibelauslegung,* Vol. 4, *Von der Aufklärung bis zum 20. Jahrhundert.* Munich: Beck, 2001. Translated into English by Leo G. Perdue as *History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol. 4, *From the Enlightenment to the Twentieth Century*. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 63. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

–. "The Role of the Old Testament in the German Liberal Protestant Theology of the Nineteenth Century." In *Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms, 1850–1914*, edited by Henning Graf Reventlow and William Farmer, 132–48.Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 192. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Riehm, Eduard. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Vol. 1, *Die Thorah und die vorderen Propheten*, edited by Alexander Brandt. Halle: Strien, 1889.
Ringer, Fritz K. *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933*. Rev. ed. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1990.
Robinson, Chase F. "Islamic Historical Writing, Eighth through the Tenth Centuries." In *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, edited by Chase F. Robinson and Sarah Foot, Vol. 2, *400–1400*, 238–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
Robinson, George L. "August Dillmann." *The Biblical World* 4, no. 4 (1894): 244–58.
Rogerson, John W. *Anthropology and the Old Testament*. Repr. ed. The Biblical Seminar. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
–. *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 134. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974.
–. *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany*. [Philadelphia]: Fortress Press, 1984.
–. *The Bible and Criticism in Victorian Britain: Profiles of F. D. Maurice and William Robertson Smith*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 201. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
–. "Wellhausen and Robertson Smith as Sociologists of early Arabia and ancient Israel." *Journal of Scottish Thought* 1, no. 2 (2008): 53–61.
Rollmann, Hans. "Duhm, Lagarde, Ritschl und der irrationale Religionsbegriff der Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule. Die Vita hospitis Heinrich Hackmanns als geistes- und theologiegeschichtliches Dokument." *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 34, no. 3 (1982): 276–79.
–. "Ein Brief Adolf von Harnacks an Rudolf Otto über die Gnadenreligion Indiens." *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 31, no. 4 (1979): 399–401.
–. "*Paulus alienus*: William Wrede on Comparing Jesus and Paul." In *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare,* edited by Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd, 23–45. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984.
–. "Theologie und Religionsgeschichte. Zeitgenössische Stimmen zur Diskussion um die religionsgeschichtliche Methode und die Einführung religionsgeschichtlicher Lehrstühle in den theologischen Fakultäten um die Jahrhundertwende." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 80 (1983): 69–84.
Roos, Friedrich. *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Pentateuchs, insbesondere seiner Gesetzgebung. Eine Prüfung der Wellhausen'schen Hypothese*. Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1883.
Rudolph, Kurt. *Die Religionsgeschichte an der Leipziger Universität und die Entwicklung der Religionswissenschaft. Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte und zum Problem der Religionswissenschaft*. Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse 107/1. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.
–. "Eduard Nordens Bedeutung für die frühchristliche Religionsgeschichte, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der 'Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule.'" In *Eduard Norden (1868–1941)*, edited by Bernhard Kytzler, Kurt Rudolph, and Jörg Rüpke, 83–105. Palingenesia 49. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994.
–. *Geschichte und Probleme der Religionswissenschaft.* Studies in the History of Religions 53. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
–. "Leipzig und die Religionswissenschaft." *Numen* 9, no. 1 (1962): 53–68.
–. "Wellhausen as an Arabist." In *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, edited by Douglas A. Knight, 111–55. Semeia 25. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

Ruppert, Stefan. *Kirchenrecht und Kulturkampf. Historische Legitimation, politische Mitwirkung und wissenschaftliche Begleitung durch die Schule Emil Ludwig Richters*. Jus Ecclesiasticum 70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Rupprecht, Eduard. *Des Rätsels Lösung, oder Beiträge zur richtigen Lösung des Pentateuchsrätsels für den christlichen Glauben und die Wissenschaft*, Vol. 2, *Erweis der Echtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit des Pentateuch für die Wissenschaft.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1896.

Ruprecht, Wilhelm. *Väter und Söhne. Zwei Jahrhunderte Buchhändler in einer deutschen Universitätsstadt.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935.

Sasson, Jack M. "On Choosing Models for Recreating Israelite Pre-Monarchic History." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 21 (1981): 3–24.

Sayce, Archibald Henry. *The Archæology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907.

Schäfer, Christian. *Alfred Rahlfs (1865–1935) und die kritische Edition der Septuaginta. Eine biographisch-wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studie.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 489. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

Schemann, Ludwig. *Paul de Lagarde. Ein Lebens- und Erinnerungsbild.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: Matthes, 1920.

–. "Paul de Lagarde. Ein Nachruf." *Bayreuther Blätter* 15, no. 6 (1892): 185–210.

Schmidt, Hans. *Die großen Propheten*. 1st ed., with introductions by Hermann Gunkel. Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, in Auswahl neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt 2/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915.

Schmithals, Walter. "Johannes Weiß als Wegbereiter der Formgeschichte." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 80, no. 4 (1983): 389–410. Reprinted in *Paulus, die Evangelien und das Urchristentum. Beiträge von und zu Walter Schmithals zu seinem 80. Geburtstag*, edited by Cilliers Breytenbach, 328–54. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Schoeler, Gregor. "Die Frage der schriftlichen oder mündlichen Überlieferung der Wissenschaften im frühen Islam." *Der Islam* 62, no. 2 (1985): 201–30.

Scholtz, Gunter. "The Phenomenon of 'Historicism' as a Backcloth of Biblical Scholarship." In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, edited by Magne Sæbø, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, 64–89. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *Parerga und Paralipomena. Kleine philosophische Schriften*. 1st ed. 2 vols. Berlin: Hahn, 1851. 2nd ed., edited by Julius Frauenstädt. 2 vols. Berlin: Hahn, 1862.

–. *The Art of Literature: A Series of Essays*. Edited and translated from German by T. Bailey Saunders. 1st ed. Schopenhauer Series 4. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1891.

Schreiber, Theodor. *Apollon Pythoktonos. Ein Beitrag zur griechischen Religions- und Kunstgeschichte*. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1879.

Schröder, Otto. *Die Erteilung der Doktorwürde an den Universitäten Deutschlands.* Halle: Waisenhaus, 1908.

Schumann, G. *Die Wellhausen'sche Pentateuchtheorie in ihren Grundzügen dargestellt und auf ihre Haltbarkeit geprüft*. Karlsruhe: Reiff, 1892.

Schütte, Hans-Walter. "Theologie als Religionsgeschichte. Das Reformprogramm Paul de Lagardes." *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 8 (1966): 111–20.

Schwartz, Eduard. "Julius Wellhausen." In *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Geschäftliche Mitteilungen aus dem Jahre 1918*, by Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 43–73. Berlin: Weidmann, 1918.

Reprinted, without appendices, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, by Eduard Schwartz, Vol. 1, *Vergangene Gegenwärtigkeiten*, 326–61. 1st ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938.

Scurlock, JoAnn, and Richard H. Beal, eds. *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's* Chaoskampf *Hypothesis*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

Segal, Robert A. "William Robertson Smith: Sociologist or theologian?" *Religion* 38 (2008): 9–24.

Seydel, Rudolf. *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha-Sage und Buddha-Lehre mit fortlaufender Rücksicht auf andere Religionskreise untersucht*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1882.

–. *Die Religion und die Religionen. Vorträge gehalten im Deutschen Protestanten-Verein zu Leipzig*. Leipzig: Findel, 1872.

Sharpe, Eric J. *Comparative Religion: A History*. 2nd ed. La Salle: Open Court, 1986.

Shavit, Yaacov, and Mordechai Eran. *The Hebrew Bible Reborn: From Holy Scripture to the Book of Books, A History of Biblical Culture and the Battles over the Bible in Modern Judaism*. Translated from Hebrew by Chaya Naor. Studia Judaica 38. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Sheehan, Jonathan. *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Shoemaker, Stephen J. "Muḥammad and the Qur'ān." In *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, edited by Scott F. Johnson, 1078–1108. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

–. *The Death of a Prophet: The End of Muhammad's Life and the Beginnings of Islam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Shortall, Sarah. "Lost in Translation: Religion and the Writing of History." *Modern Intellectual History* 13, no. 1 (2016): 273–86.

Sieg, Ulrich. "Der Preis des Bildungsstrebens. Jüdische Geisteswissenschaftler im Kaiserreich." In *Juden, Bürger, Deutsche. Zur Geschichte von Vielfalt und Differenz, 1800–1933.* Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

–. *Deutschlands Prophet. Paul de Lagarde und die Ursprünge des modernen Antisemitismus*. Munich: Hanser, 2007. Translated into English by Ulrich Sieg and Linda Ann Marianiello as *Germany's Prophet: Paul de Lagarde & the Origins of Modern Antisemitism*. Tauber Institute Series for the Study of European Jewry. Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2013.

Silberman, Lou H. "Wellhausen and Judaism." In *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, edited by Douglas A. Knight, 75–82. Semeia 25. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

Silk, M. S., and J. P. Stern. *Nietzsche on Tragedy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Ska, Jean Louis. "The 'History of Israel': Its Emergence as an Independent Discipline." In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, edited by Magne Sæbø, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, 307–45. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Skinner, Quentin. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas." *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53.

Smend, Rudolf, Jr. "A Conservative Approach in Opposition to a Historical-critical Investigation: E. W. Hengstenberg and Franz Delitzsch." In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, edited by Magne Sæbø, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, 494–520. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

–. *Bibel und Wissenschaft. Historische Aufsätze*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

–. "De Wette und das Verhältnis zwischen historischer Bibelkritik und philosophischem System im 19. Jahrhundert." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 14 (1958): 107–19. Reprinted in *Epochen der Bibelkritik*, by Rudolf Smend, 145–54. Gesammelte Studien 3. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 109. Munich: Kaiser, 1991.
–. "Der Alttestamentler Julius Wellhausen und Wilamowitz." In *Wilamowitz in Greifswald. Akten der Tagung zum 150. Geburtstag Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs in Greifswald, 19–22. Dezember 1998*, edited by William M. Calder, III, et al., 197–215. Hildesheim: Olms, 2000.
–. "Ein Fakultätswechsel. Wellhausen und die Theologie." In *Zwischen Mose und Karl Barth. Akademische Vorträge*, by Rudolf Smend, 274–300. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
–. *From Astruc to Zimmerli: Old Testament Scholarship in three Centuries*. Translated into English by Margaret Kohl. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007. Originally published, with some divergence in content, as *Deutsche Alttestamentler in drei Jahrhunderten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
–. "Gunkel und Wellhausen." In *Hermann Gunkel (1862–1932)*, edited by Ernst-Joachim Waschke, 21–40. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 141. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013.
–. "Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. Zur Entstehung von Julius Wellhausens Buch." In *Geschichte–Tradition–Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, Vol. 1, *Judentum*, edited by Peter Schäfer, 36–42. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1996.
–. *Julius Wellhausen. Ein Bahnbrecher in drei Disziplinen*. Munich: Carl Friedrich von Siemens Stiftung, 2006.
–. "Julius Wellhausen and His *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*." In *Julius Wellhausen and His* Prolegomena to the History of Israel, edited by Douglas A. Knight, 1–20. Semeia 25. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983. The German manuscript was later published as "Julius Wellhausen und seine Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels." In *Epochen der Bibelkritik*, by Rudolf Smend, 168–85. Gesammelte Studien 3. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 109. Munich: Kaiser, 1991. Reprinted in *Bibel und Wissenschaft. Historische Aufsätze*, by Rudolf Smend, 141–58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
–. *Kritiker und Exegeten. Porträtskizzen zu vier Jahrhunderten alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.
–. "Kuenen und Wellhausen." In *Abraham Kuenen (1828–1891): His Major Contributions to the Study of the Old Testament. A Collection of Studies Published on the Occasion of the Centenary of Abraham Kuenen's Death (10 December 1991),* edited by P. B. Dirksen and A. van der Kooij, 113–27. Oudtestamentische Studiën 29. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
–. "Richtungen. Ein Rückblick auf die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 97 (2000): 259–75.
–. "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen." In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, edited by Magne Sæbø, Vol. 3.1, *The Nineteenth Century*, 424–53. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
–. "Theologie im Alten Testament." In *Verifikationen. Festschrift für Gerhard Ebeling zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by Eberhard Jüngel, Johannes Wallmann, and Wilfrid Werbeck, 11–26. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1982. Reprinted in *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments*, by Rudolf Smend, 104–17. Gesammelte Studien 1. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 99. Munich: Beck, 1986.

–. "Wellhausen in Göttingen." In *Theologie in Göttingen. Eine Vorlesungsreihe*, edited by Bernd Moeller, 306–24. Göttingen Universitätsschriften A/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
–. "Wellhausen in Greifswald." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 78 (1981): 141–76.
–. "Wellhausen, Julius." In *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 2nd ed, Vol. 21, *Wel-Zy*, edited by Fred Skolnik, 6–7. Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 2007.
–. "Wellhausen und das Judentum." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 79, no. 3 (1982): 249–82. Reprinted in *Epochen der Bibelkritik*, by Rudolf Smend, 186–215. Gesammelte Studien 3. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 109. Munich: Kaiser, 1991.
–. "William Robertson Smith and Julius Wellhausen." In *William Robertson Smith: Essays in Reassessment*, edited by William Johnstone, 226–42. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 189. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
–. "Wissende Prophetendeutung. Zum 150. Geburtstag Bernhard Duhms." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 54 (1998): 289–99.
–. *Zwischen Mose und Karl Barth. Akademische Vorträge*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
–. Review of *Hermann Gunkel. Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode*, by Werner Klatt. *Theologische Zeitschrift* 26 (1970): 367–70.
–. Review of *Vatke und Wellhausen. Geschichtsphilosophische Voraussetzungen und historiographische Motive für die Darstellung der Religion und Geschichte Israels durch Wilhelm Vatke und Julius Wellhausen*, by Lothar Perlitt. *Vetus Testamentum* 16, no. 1 (1966): 130–34.
Smend, Rudolf, Sr. Review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 16, no. 26 (1895): 801–05.
Smith, Henry Preserved. "Recent Theological Literature. Books on the Science of Religion." *American Journal of Theology* 10, no. 4 (1906): 701–05.
–. "The Critical Theories of Julius Wellhausen." *The Presbyterian Review* 3, no. 10 (1882): 357–88.
Smith, Jonathan Z. "Adde Parvum Parvo Magnus Acervus Erit." *History of Religion* 11, no. 1 (1971): 67–90. Reprinted in *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*, by Jonathan Z. Smith, 240–64. Leiden: Brill, 1978. Reprinted Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
–. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 14, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
–. *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
–. *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
–. "The 'End' of Comparison: Redescription and Rectification." In *A Magic Still Dwells: Comparative Religion in the Postmodern Age*, edited by Kimberley C. Patton and Benjamin C. Ray, 237–41. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
Smith, William Robertson. "Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament." *Journal for Philology* 9 (1880): 75–100.
–. *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1885.
–. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: First Series, The Fundamental Institutions*. 1st ed. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1889.

–. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: Second and Third Series*, edited with an introduction by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 183. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995 [1890, 1891].
Söderblom, Nathan. Review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel. *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 35 (1897): 356–69.
Spieckermann, Hermann. "Das neue Bild der Religionsgeschichte Israels – eine Herausforderung der Theologie?" *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 105 (2008): 259–80.
–. "Exegetischer Individualismus. Julius Wellhausen, 1844–1918." In *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus*, Vol. 2, Part 2, *Kaiserreich*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 231–50. 3 vols. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1993.
–. "From Biblical Exegesis to Reception History." *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 1, no. 3 (2012): 327–50.
–. "'YHWH Bless You and Keep You': The Relation of History of Israelite Religion and Old Testament Theology Reconsidered." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 23, no. 2 (2009): 165–82.
Sprenger, Aloys. *Das Leben und die Lehre des Moḥammad nach bisher größtentheils unbenutzten Quellen*. 1st ed. 3 vols. Berlin: Nicolai, 1861–65. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Berlin: Nicolai, 1869.
–. *Mohammed und der Koran. Eine psychologische Studie.* Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge n.s. 4/84–85. Hamburg: Verlagsanstalt und Druckerei A[ctien]-G[esellschaft] [Richter], 1889.
–. *The Life of Mohammad from Original Sources*. Allahabad: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1851.
Stackert, Jeffrey. A *Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
Stade, Bernhard. *Ausgewählte akademische Reden und Abhandlungen*. 2nd ed. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1907.
–. *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments,* Vol. 1*, Die Religion Israels und die Entstehung des Judentums*. Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaften 2/2.1. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1905.
–. "Die neuesten Stimmen über die Reform der Doctorpromotion." *Die Grenzboten* 35, no. 1/2 (1876): 450–57.
–. *Die Reorganisation der Theologischen Fakultät zu Gießen in den Jahren 1878 bis 1882, Thatsachen, nicht Legende. Eine Streitschrift wider Nippold und Genossen*. Giessen: Ricker, 1894.
–. *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik*, Vol. 1, *Schriftlehre, Lautlehre, Formenlehre*. Leizig: Vogel, 1879.
–. Review of *Geschichte Israels,* Vol. 1, by Julius Wellhausen. *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 26 (June 28, 1879): 825–28.
Staerk, Willy. Review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel. *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 39, n.s. 4 (1896): 320–34.
Stansell, Gary. "The Poet's Prophet: Bishop Robert Lowth's Eighteenth-Century Commentary on Isaiah." In *"As Those Who Are Taught": The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull, 223–42. SBL Symposium Series 27. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.
Stern, Fritz. *The Failure of Illiberalism: Essays on the Political Culture of Modern Germany*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
–. "The Political Consequences of the Unpolitical German." *History* 3 (1960): 104–34.

–. *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.

Stocking, George W., Jr. "On the Limits of 'Presentism' and 'Historicism' in the Historiography of the Behavioral Sciences." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 1, no. 3 (1965): 211–18. Reprinted in *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*, by George W. Stocking, Jr., 1–12. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

–. *Victorian Anthropology*. New York: Free Press, 1987.

Strauß, David Friedrich. *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Osiander, 1835–36.

–. *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Osiander/Stuttgart: Köhler, 1840–41.

Stroumsa, Guy G. "Richard Simon: From Philology to Comparison." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001): 89–107.

Stübe, Rudolf. *Jüdisch-babylonische Zaubertexte*. Halle: Krause, 1895.

Sweeney, Marvin A., and Ehud Ben Zvi, eds. *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Tal, Uriel. *Christians and Jews in Germany: Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870–1914*. Translated from Hebrew by Noah Jonathan Jacobs. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975.

Tenorth, Heinz-Elmar. "Studenten, Studium und Lehre." In *Geschichte der Universität unter den Linden*, Vol. 1, *Gründung und Blütezeit der Universität zu Berlin, 1810–1918*, edited by Charles E. McClelland and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, 567–636. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012.

Theissen, Gerd, and Dagmar Winter. *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria*. Translated from German by M. Eugene Boring. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.

Thompson, R. J. *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 19. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Tilitzki, Christian. *Die Albertus-Universität Königsberg. Ihre Geschichte von der Reichsgründung bis zum Untergang der Provinz Ostpreußen*, Vol. 1, *1871–1918*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. "Julius Wellhausen's Approach to the Aramaic Gospels." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 101 (1951): 125–37.

–. "The Outlook for American Oriental Studies. The Presidential Address for 1918." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 38 (1918): 107–20.

–. "The Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels." In *Studies in the History of Religions: Presented to Crawford Howell Toy by Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends*, edited by David Gordon Lyon and George Foot Moore, 269–317. New York: Macmillan, 1912. Reprinted as *The Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels*, by C. C. Torrey. New York: Macmillan, 1912.

Trible, Phyllis. *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Troeltsch (Tröltsch), Ernst. "Die 'kleine Göttinger Fakultät' von 1890." *Die Christliche Welt* 34 (1920), co. 281–83. Reprinted in *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen. Eine Dokumentation*, edited by Gerd Lüdemann and Martin Schröder, 22–23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

–. "Geschichte und Metaphysik." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 8 (1898): 1–69.

–. "Religionsphilosophie." In *Die Philosophie im Beginn des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Festschrift für Kuno Fischer*, edited by Wilhelm Windelband, 423–86. 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1907.

Trüper, Henning. "Wie es uneigentlich gewesen. Zum Gebrauch der Fußnote bei Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918)." *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, n.s. 23, no. 2 (2013): 329–42.

Tucker, Gene M. *Form Criticism of the Old Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Turner, James. *Religion Enters the Academy: The Origins of the Scholarly Study of Religion in America*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011.

Twain, Mark, *Following the Equator: A Journey Around the World*. Hartford: The American Publishing Company, 1897.

University of Göttingen. *Chronik der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1889–90.* Göttingen: Dieterich, 1890.

–. *Chronik der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1899–1900*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1900.

–. *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1901*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1902.

–. *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1902*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1903.

–. *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1903*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1904.

–. *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1904*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1905.

–. *Chronik der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen für das Rechnungsjahr 1905*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1906.

Usener, Hermann. "Kallone." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* n.s. 23 (1868): 316–77. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, by Hermann Usener, Vol. 4, *Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte*, 1–93. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.

Van Seters, John. *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Vatke, Wilhelm. *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt*, Vol. 1.1, *Die Religion des Alten Testamentes nach den kanonischen Büchern entwickelt*. Berlin: Bethge, 1835. Only the first volume appeared.

–. *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Nach Vorlesungen*, edited by Hermann G. S. Preiss, with a foreword by Adolf Hilgenfeld. Bonn: Strauss, 1886.

Veysey, Laurence. "Reappraising the Chicago School of Sociology." *Reviews in American History* 6, no. 1 (1978): 114–19.

Viaene, Vincent. "Paul de Lagarde: A Nineteenth-Century 'Radical' Conservative—and Precursor of National Socialism?" *European History Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (1996): 527–57.

Voegelin, Eric. *Order and History*, Vol. 1, *Israel and Revelation*, edited by Maurice P. Hogan. The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin 14. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001.

Voigt, Friedemann. "Die historische Methode der Theologie. Zu Ernst Troeltschs Programm einer theologischen Standortepistemologie." In *"Geschichte durch Geschichte überwinden". Ernst Troeltsch in Berlin*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 155–73. Troeltsch-Studien n.s. 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

Volbehr, Friedrich, and Richard Weyl. *Professoren und Dozenten der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, 1665–1915*. Kiel: Schmidt & Klaunig, 1916.

Volk, K. J. *Entwicklungsgeschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion nach der Graf-Wellhausen'schen Hypothese. Vortrag auf der Jahresversammlung des Wissenschaftlichen Predigervereins am 1. Juli 1890 gehalten*. Karlsruhe: Reiff, 1891.

Vollmer, Ulrich. "Carl Clemen (1865–1940) als Emeritus." *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 9, no. 2 (2001): 185–204.

–. "Carl Clemen und die iranische Religion." In *Religionswissenschaft im Kontext der Asienwissenschaften. 99 Jahre religionswissenschaftliche Lehre und Forschung in Bonn*, edited by Manfred Hutter, 99–111. Religionen in der pluralen Welt: Religionswissenschaftliche Studien. Berlin: LIT, 2009.

vom Bruch, Rüdiger. *Wissenschaft, Politik und öffentliche Meinung. Gelehrtenpolitik im Wilhelminischen Deutschland (1890–1914)*. Historische Studien 435. Husum: Matthiesen, 1980.

von Baudissin, Wolf Wilhelm Graf. "Dillmann, August." In *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. 4, *Christiana–Dorothea*. 3rd ed., edited by Albert Hauck, 662–69. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898.

von Gall, August Freiherr. "Bernhard Stade. Ein Nachruf." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 27, no. 1 (1907): i–xix.

von Garbe, Richard. *Indien und das Christentum. Eine Untersuchung der religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge.* Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1914.

von Rabenau, Konrad. "Hermann Gunkel auf rauhen Pfaden nach Halle." *Evangelische Theologie* 30 (1970): 433–44.

von Roth, Rudolf. "Die höchsten Götter der arischen Völker." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 6 (1852): 67–77.

–. "Ueber die heiligen Schriften der Arier." *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 2 (1857): 141–53.

–. "Zur Geschichte der Religionen, 1. Die Brahma-Religion." *Theologische Jahrbücher* 5, no. 3 (1846): 346–63.

–. "Zur Geschichte der Religionen, 2. Die Buddha-Religion." *Theologische Jahrbücher* 6, no. 2 (1847): 175–90.

–. "Zur Geschichte der Religionen, 3. Die Ormuzd-Religion." *Theologische Jahrbücher* 8, no. 2 (1849): 281–297.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. *Der Glaube der Hellenen*. 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1931–32.

–. *Erinnerungen, 1848–1914.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: Koehler, 1928.

–. "Future Philology! A Reply to Friedrich Nietzsche's The Birth of Tragedy." Translated into English by G. Postl, B. Babich, and H. Schmid. *New Nietzsche Studies* 4, no. 1/2 (2000): 1–33. Originally published as *Zukunftsphilologie! eine erwidrung auf Friedrich Nietzsches "geburt der tragödie"* (*sic*). Berlin: Borntraeger Brothers, 1872.

Wahrmund, Adolph. "Paul de Lagarde." *Bayreuther Blätter* 15, no. 6 (1892): 210–22.

Warburg, Margit. "William Robertson Smith and the Study of Religion." *Religion* 19 (1989): 41–61.

Warner, Sean M. "Primitive Saga Men." *Vetus Testamentum* 29, no. 3 (1979): 325–335.

Waschke, Ernst-Joachim, ed. *Hermann Gunkel (1862–1932)*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 141. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013.

Weber, Ferdinand Wilhelm. *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud dargestellt*, edited by Franz Delitzsch and Georg Schnedermann. 1st ed. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1880. Reprinted with a new title, *Die Lehren des Talmud, quellenmässig, systematisch und gemeinverständlich dargestellt*. Schriften des

Institutum Judaicum 2/1. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1886. 2nd ed. as *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften gemeinfasslich dargestellt*. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1897.

Weber, Max. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, Vol. 3, *Das antike Judentum*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1921. Originally published in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* between 1917 and 1919, Vol. 44, 52–138, 349–443, 601–626, Vol. 46, 40–113, 311–66, 541–604. Translated into English by Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale as *Ancient Judaism*. Glencoe: Free Press, 1952.

Wegeler, Cornelia. "Das Institut für Altertumskunde der Universität Göttingen 1921–1962. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie seit Wilamowitz." In *Die Universität Göttingen unter dem Nationalsozialismus*, edited by Heinrich Becker, Hans-Joachim Dahms, and Cornelia Wegeler, 337–64. 2nd ed. Munich: Saur, 1998.

Weidner, Daniel. *Gershom Scholem. Politisches, esoterisches und historiographisches Schreiben*. Munich: Fink, 2003.

–. "'Geschichte gegen den Strich bürsten': Julius Wellhausen und die jüdische 'Gegengeschichte.'" *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 54, no. 1 (2002): 32–61.

–. "The Political Theology of Ethical Monotheism." In *Judaism, Liberalism, and Political Theology*, edited by Randi Rashkover and Martin Kavka, 178–96. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014.

–, ed. *Urpoesie und Morgenland. Johann Gottfried Herders "Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie."* LiteraturForschung 6. Berlin: Kulturverlag Kadmos, 2008.

Weinhardt, Joachim. *Wilhelm Herrmanns Stellung in der Ritschlschen Schule*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 97. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1996.

Weiss, Johannes. "Wellhausens Evangelienkommentar." *Theologische Rundschau* 8, no. 1 (1906): 1–9.

Wellhausen, Julius. Announcement for the fourth edition of Friedrich Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 14 (3 April 1878): 447–48.

–. *Briefe*, edited by Rudolf Smend, Peter Porzig, and Reinhard Müller. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

–. *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz*. Berlin: Reimer, 1902. Translated into English by Margaret Graham Weir as *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1927. Reprinted Khayats Oriental reprints 6. Beirut: Khayats, 1963. Reprinted Orientalism: Early Sources 7. London: Routledge, 2000. Reprinted Routledge Library Editions: History of the Middle East. London: Routledge, 2017. Translated into Arabic by Yūsuf al-ʿUshsh as *al-Dawlah al-ʿArabīyah wa-suqūṭuhā*. Damascus: Syrian University Press, 1956. Translated into Turkish by Fikret Işıltan as *Arap devleti ve sukutu*. Faculty of Theology Publications 42. Ankara: Ankara University Press, 1963. Translated by T. M. Shulikovoy into Russian as *Arabskiy khalifat: zolotoy vek islama*. Moscow: Centerpoligraph, 2017.

–. *Das Evangelium Johannis*. Berlin: Reimer, 1908.

–. *Das Evangelium Lucae*. Berlin: Reimer, 1904.

–. *Das Evangelium Marci*. 1st ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1903.

–. *Das Evangelium Matthaei*. 1st ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1904.

–. *De gentibus et familiis Judaeis quae 1. Chr. 2.4. enumerantur*. Göttingen: Dieterich (Kaestner), 1870. Translated into Hebrew by Lizah Ulman as *Mishpeḥot Yehudah: she-nimnu be-sefer Divre ha-Yamim 1–2,4*, edited with a foreword by Gershon Galil. Ḳunṭresim, meḳorot u-meḥḳarim 63. Jerusalem: Merkaz Dinur, 1985.

–. *Der arabische Josippus.* Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse n.s. 1/4. Berlin: Weidmann, 1897.
–. *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871.
–. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 3rd ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1899.
–. "Die Kämpfe der Araber mit den Romäern in der Zeit der Umaijiden." In *Nachrichten von der Königl[ichen] Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1901*, by Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 414–47. Göttingen: Dieterich (Horstmann), 1902. Translated into English by Michael Bonner as "Arab wars with the Byzantines in the Umayyad period." In *Arab-Byzantine relations in early Islamic times*, edited by Michael Bonner, 31–64. Formation of the Classical Islamic World 8. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
–. *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte.* 1st ed. Greifswald: Bamberg, 1874. Translated into English by Mark E. Biddle as *The Pharisees and the Sadducees: An Examination of Internal Jewish History*. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2001. The front cover reads *The Pharisees and Sadducees*, while the information on original publication accidentally misspells the German title. Translated into Hungarian by Szabó Csaba as *A farizeusok és a szadduceusok*. Budapest: Kálvin, 2001.
–. *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam.* Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse n.s. 5/2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1901. Translated into Arabic by ʿAbd ʾal-Raḥmān Badawī as *ʾAḥzāb ʾal-muʿāraḍah ʾal-siyāsīyah ʾal-dīnīyah fī ṣadr ʾal-ʾIslām: ʾal-Khawārij wa-ʾal-Shīʿah.* Dirāsāt Islāmīyah 22. Cairo: Egyptian Renaissance Library, 1958. Translated into English by R. C. Ostle and S. M. Walzer as *The religio-political factions in early Islam*, edited by R. C. Ostle. North-Holland medieval translations 3. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1975. Translated into Turkish by Fikret Işıltan as *İslamiyetin ilk devrinde dinî-siyasî muhalefet partileri.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1989.
–. "Die Zeitrechnung des Buchs der Könige seit der Theilung des Reichs." *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 20 (1875): 607–40. A correction was made in "Berichtigung." *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 21 (1876): 151.
–. *Ein Gemeinwesen ohne Obrigkeit. Rede zur Feier des Geburtstages Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs am 27. Januar 1900 im Namen der Georg-Augusts-Universität.* Göttingen: Dieterich, 1900. Translated into English as "Tribal Life of the Epic Period," in *The Historians' History of the World: A Comprehensive Narrative of the Rise and Development of Nations as Recorded by Over Two Thousand of the Great Writers of All Ages*, edited by Henry Smith Williams, Vol. 8, *Parthians, Sassenids, and Arabs; the Crusades and the Papacy*, 284–93. New York: Hooper & Jackson, 1909.
–. *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*. 1st ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1905. 2nd ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1911.
–. *Erweiterungen und Änderungen im vierten Evangelium*. Berlin: Reimer, 1907.
–. *Evangelienkommentare. Nachdruck von "Einleitung in die ersten drei Evangelien" 2. Aufl. 1911, "Das Evangelium Matthaei" 2. Aufl. 1914, "Das Evangelium Marci" 2. Aufl. 1909, "Das Evangelium Lucae" 1. Aufl. 1904, "Das Evangelium Johannis" 1. Aufl. 1908*. With an introduction by Martin Hengel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987.
–. "Ferdinand Wüstenfeld." In *Nachrichten von der Königl[ichen]Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Gesellschaftliche Mittheilungen aus dem Jahre 1899*, by Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 79–80. Göttingen: Dieterich (Horstmann), 1899.

–. *Geschichte Israels*. Greifswald: printed privately, 1880. Reprinted in *Grundrisse zum Alten Testament*, by Julius Wellhausen, edited by Rudolf Smend, 13–64. Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert, Altes Testament, 27. Munich: Kaiser, 1965.
–. *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. 1. Berlin: Reimer, 1878. 2nd ed. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. Berlin: Reimer, 1883. Translated into English by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies as *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, with a reprint of the article "Israel" from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and a preface by William Robertson Smith. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885. Translated into Hebrew by Israel Yevarekhayhu as *Aḳdamot le-divre yeme Yiśra'el*. Tel Aviv: s.n., 1937/1938. Reprinted Jerusalem: Akademon, 1977. Translated into Russian by Nikolai Mikhailovich Nikolsky as *Vvedenie v istoriyu Izrailya*. St. Petersburg: Piramida, 1909. 2nd ed. Moscow: URSS, 2013.
–. *Grundrisse zum Alten Testament*, edited by Rudolf Smend. Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert, Altes Testament, 27. Munich: Kaiser, 1965.
–. "Heinrich Ewald." In *Festschrift zur Feier des hundertfünfzigjährigen Bestehens der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen. Beiträge zur Gelehrtengeschichte Göttingens*, 61–88. Berlin: Weidmann, 1901. Reprinted in *Grundrisse zum Alten Testament*, by Julius Wellhausen, edited by Rudolf Smend, 120–38. Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert, Altes Testament, 27. Munich: Kaiser, 1965.
–. "Israel." In *Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature*. 9th ed, Vol. 13, *Infant–Kant*, 396–432. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881. Reprinted in *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. 3rd ed. Published as *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah*, with an appendix from *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 1.1 ("Judaism and Christianity"). London: Adam & Charles Black, 1891. Translated into Hungarian by Kardos Albert as *Izráel népének története: Jeruzsálem második pusztulásáig*. Történeti kézikönyvek. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1886. 2nd ed. Az Athenaeum kézikönyvtára Irodalmi és történelmi sorozat. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1892. Translated into Norwegian as *Israels og Judas historie i korthed*. Bibliothek for de tusen hjem 335–38. Høvik: Sørensen, 1889.
–. "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion." In *Die christliche Religion mit Einschluß der israelitisch-jüdischen Religion*, edited by Paul Hinneberg, 1–40. Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele 1/4. Berlin: Teubner, 1906. Reprinted in *Grundrisse zum Alten Testament*, by Julius Wellhausen, edited by Rudolf Smend, 65–109. Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert, Altes Testament, 27. Munich: Kaiser, 1965.
–. *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte.* 1st ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1894. 7th ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1914.
–. "Moab." In *Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature*. 9th ed. Vol. 16, *Mena–Mosul*, 533–36. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883.
–. "Mohammedanism, Part 1: Mohammed and the First Four Caliphs." In *Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature*. 9th ed. Vol. 16, *Mena–Mosul*, 545–65. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883.
–. "Moses." In *Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature*. 9th ed. Vol. 16, *Mena–Mosul*, 860–61. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883.
–. *Muhammed in Medina. Das ist Vakidi's Kitab alMaghazi in verkürzter deutscher Wiedergabe*. Berlin: Reimer, 1882.

–. "Pentateuch and Joshua." In *Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature*. 9th ed. Vol. 18, *Orne–Phthisis*, 505–15. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.
–. "Reiske, Johann Jacob." In *Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature*. 9th ed. Vol. 20, *Prudentius–Roswitha*, 354–55. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1886.
–. *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*. 6 vols. Berlin: Reimer, 1884–99. Part of Vol. 6, *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams*, translated into Turkish by Fikret Işıltan as *İslamın en eski tarihine giriş*. Faculty of Letters Publications 844. Istanbul: University of Istanbul Faculty of Literature, 1960.
–. "Strauß' *Leben Jesu*." *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* (Munich) 45 (March 24, 1908): 353–54.
–. "Ueber den bisherigen Gang und den gegenwärtigen Stand der Keilentzifferung." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, n.s. 31 (1876): 153–75.
–. "Ueber den geschichtlichen Wert des zweiten Makkabäerbuchs, im Verhältnis zum ersten." In *Nachrichten von der Königl*[*ichen*] *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1905*, by Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 117–63. Göttingen: Dieterich (Horstmann), 1905.
–. "Wüstenfeld: H. Ferdinand W." In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Vol. 55, *Nachträge bis 1899: Wandersleb–Zwirner*, 139–40. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1910.
–. Review of *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte. Der Gott Israels und die Götter der Heiden*, by Friedrich Baethgen. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 9, no. 37 (1888): 1321–22.
–. Review of *Coutumes des Arabes au Pays de Moab*, by Antonin Jaussen. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 33, no. 20 (1908): 553–54.
–. Review of *Der Ahnenkultus und die Urreligion Israels*, by Carl Grüneisen. *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 21, no. 20 (1900): 1301–03.
–. Review of *Der Ursprung des Monotheismus. Eine historische Kritik des Hebräischen Alterthums, insbesondere der Offenbarungsgeschichte. Kritik der Patriarchengeschichte*, by Julius Popper. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 4, no. 26 (1879): 609–11.
–. Review of *Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Eine historische Untersuchung*, by Eduard Meyer. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 159, no. 2 (1897): 89–97.
–. Review of *Die griechischen Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orientalischen Religionen*, by Otto Gruppe. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 9, no. 14 (1888): 507–09.
–. Review of *Die semitischen Sprachen. Eine Skizze*, by Theodor Nöldeke. *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 8, no. 27 (1887): 966–68.
–. Review of *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion dargestellt*, by Bernhard Duhm. *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 21 (1876): 152–58.
–. Review of *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, by Bernhard Stade. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 3, no. 19 (1882): 681–82.
–. Review of *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik, nebst ausgewählten Inschriften*, Vol. 1, *Texte*, Vol. 2, *Tafeln*, by Mark Lidzbarski. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 161, no. 8 (1899): 602–08.
–. Review of *Hebräisch und Semitisch, Prolegomena und Grundlinien einer Geschichte der semitischen Sprachen, nebst einem Exkurs über die vorjosuanische Sprache Israels und die Pentateuchquelle PC*, by Eduard König. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 163, no. 9 (1901): 738–42.

–. Review of *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, Vol. 2, by Ernest Renan. *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 10, no. 14 (1889): 511–12.
–. Review of *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, Vol. 3, by Ernest Renan. *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 12, no. 17 (1891): 628–29.
–. Review of *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung. Ein Beitrag zur monumentalen Geographie, Geschichte und Chronologie der Assyrer*, by Eberhard Schrader. *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 29, no. 52 (1878): 1691–93.
–. Review of *Kulturgeschichte des Judentums von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*, by Otto Henne-Am Rhyn. *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* (*sic*) 2, no. 24 (1881): 970–71.
–. Review of *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Orients. Die Assyriologie in Deutschland*, by Alfred von Gutschmid. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1, no. 21 (1876): 534–38.
–. Review of *Studien in arabischen Dichtern*, Vol. 4, *Altarabische Parallelen zum Alten Testament zusammengestellt*, by Georg Jacob. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 22, no. 19 (1897): 505.
–. Review of *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Vol. 1, by Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 139, no. 6 (1877): 185–92.
–. Review of *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Vol. 2, by Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 141, no. 4 (1879): 106–11.
–. Review of *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, by George Smith. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1, no. 21 (1876): 539–41.
–. Review of *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, by William Robertson Smith. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 6, no. 11 (1881): 250–51.
–. Review of *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, by Charles M. Doughty. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 45 (1891): 172–80.
–. Review of *Ueber die Blutrache bei den vorislamischen Arabern und Mohammeds Stellung zu ihr*, by Otto Procksch. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 25, no. 13 (1900): 385.
–. Review of *Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients*, by Samuel Ives Curtiss, with a foreword by Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 166, no. 4 (1904): 351–52. However, the review mistakenly named the author as J. S. Curtiss. This volume was originally published as *Primitive Semitic Religion Today: A Record of Researches, Discoveries and Studies in Syria, Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*, with an appendix by William Hayes Ward. Chicago: Revell, [1902].
Wendte, Charles W. "International Notes 3." *The Christian Register* 85, no. 48 (1906): 1336–37.
Wensinck, Arent Jan. *Mohammed en de Joden te Medina*. Leiden: Brill, 1908. Translated into English and edited by Wolfgang Behn as *Muhammad and the Jews of Medina*, with an excursus "Muhammad's constitution of Medina" by Julius Wellhausen. 1st ed. Islamkundliche Materialien 3. Freiburg: Schwarz, 1975. 2nd ed. Berlin: Adiyok. 1982. Wellhausen's original text appeared as *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Vol. 4.2, *Muhammads Gemeindeordnung von Medina* (Berlin: Reimer, 1889).
Wessels, Antje. *Ursprungszauber. Zur Rezeption von Hermann Useners Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 51. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
Wheeler-Barclay, Marjorie. *The Science of Religion in Britain, 1860–1915*. Victorian Literature and Culture Series. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010.
–. "Victorian Evangelicalism and the Sociology of Religion: The Career of William Robertson Smith." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 54, no. 1 (1993): 59–78.

Whybray, R. N. *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 53. Repr. ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Wickert, Lothar. *Theodor Mommsen. Eine Biographie*, Vol. 4, *Größe und Grenzen*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1980.

Wicksteed, Philip H. "Abraham Kuenen." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 4, no. 4 (1892): 571–605.

–. "Kuenen's Religion of Israel." *The Academy* 8, n.s. 184 (November 13, 1875): 496–98.

Wiegers, Gerard, ed. *Modern Societies & The Science of Religions: Studies in Honor of Lammert Leertouwer.* Numen Book Series/Studies in the History of Religions 95. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Wiese, Christian. *Challenging Colonial Discourse: Jewish Studies and Protestant Theology in Wilhelmine Germany*. Translated from German by Christian Wiese and Barbara Harschav. Studies in European Judaism 10. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Wikgren, Allen. "Wellhausen on the Synoptic Gospels: A Centenary Appraisal." *Journal of Bible and Religion* 12, no. 3 (1944): 174–80.

Willet, Olaf. *Sozialgeschichte Erlanger Professoren, 1743–1933*. Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 146. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.

Willi, Thomas. *Herders Beitrag zum Verstehen des Alten Testaments.* Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik 8. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1971.

Williamson, George S. *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Williamson, H. G. M. *Holy, Holy, Holy: The Story of a Liturgical Formula.* With an introduction by Reinhard G. Kratz. Julius-Wellhausen-Vorlesung 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Willrich, Hugo. "Zur Erinnerung an Julius Wellhausen." *Deutsche Rundschau* 175 (1918): 407–12.

Wilson, Robert R. "Prophecy and Ecstasy: A Reexamination." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98, no. 3 (1979): 321–37. Reprinted in *Community, Identity, and Ideology: Social Science Approaches to the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Charles E. Carter and Carol L. Meyers. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 6. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Windisch, Ernst. *Buddha's Geburt und die Lehre von der Seelenwanderung.* Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 26/2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908.

–. *Māra und Buddha*. Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 15/4. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1895.

–. *Zwölf Hymnen des Rigveda mit Sāyaṇa's Commentar.* Leipzig: Hirzel, 1883.

Wischmeyer, Johannes. *Theologiae Facultas. Rahmenbedingungen, Akteure und Wissenschaftsorganisation protestantischer Universitätstheologie in Tübingen, Jena, Erlangen und Berlin 1850–1870*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 108. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Wokoeck, Ursula. *German Orientalism: The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945*. Culture and Civilization in the Middle East 16. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Wolfes, Matthias. *Protestantische Theologie und Moderne Welt. Studien zur Geschichte der liberalen Theologie nach 1918*. Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann 102. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.

Wrede, William. Review of *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, by Hermann Gunkel. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 21, no. 24 (1896): 623–31.

Zachhuber, Johannes. *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F. C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch.* Changing Paradigms in Historical and Systematic Theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Zahn, Adolph. *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. Beurteilung der Schrift von J. Wellhausen 1894*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1895.

Zahn, Theodor. *Der Hirt des Hermas*. Gotha: Perthes, 1868.

Zammito, John. "Herder and Historical Metanarrative: What's Philosophical about History?" In *A Companion to the Works of Johann Gottfried Herder*, edited by Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke, 65–91. Rochester: Camden House, 2009.

Zeller, Eduard. *Die Philosophie der Griechen. Eine Untersuchung über Charakter, Gang und Hauptmomente ihrer Entwicklung.* 3 vols. Tübingen: Fues, 1844–52.

–. *Platonische Studien.* Tübingen: Osiander, 1839.

–. "Über das Wesen der Religion." *Theologische Jahrbücher* 4, no. 1 (1845): 26–7 and 4, no. 2 (1845): 393–430. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriten*, by Eduard Zeller, Vol. 3, edited by Otto Leuze with H. Diels and K. Holl, 71–152. Berlin: Reimer, 1911.

–. "Über historische Kritik und ihre Anwendung auf die christlichen Religionsurkunden." *Theologische Jahrbücher* 5, no. 2 (1846): 288–321. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, by Eduard Zeller, Vol. 3, edited by Otto Leuze with H. Diels and K. Holl, 153–87. Berlin: Reimer, 1911.

Zimmerli, Walther. "Tätigkeitsbericht für das Jahr 1976." In *Jahrbuch der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen für das Jahr 1976*, 7–18. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Zimmerman, Andrew. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Zimmern, Heinrich. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion. Erste Lieferung: Die Beschwörungstafeln Šurpu*. Assyriologische Bibliothek 12. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896.

Zöckler, Otto. *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften*, Vol. 3., *Systematische Theologie*. 3rd ed. Munich: Beck, 1890.

Zscharnack, Leopold. "Overbeck, Franz." In *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 4, *Mi-R*, edited by Leopold Zscharnack and Hermann Gunkel, 843–44. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1930.

Index of Names and Subjects

Abbasids 77, 119
Academy of the Sciences
– *see also* societies/associations
– in Berlin 58, 162
– in Denmark 58
– in Göttingen 33, 58, 59, 62, 127–28, 181, 198 n. 109
Albright, William Foxwell 143 n. 81, 151 n. 113
Althoff, Friedrich 35, 40, 43–44, 52, 62, 210–11
Amos, biblical figure 103, 161, 245, 291 n. 22, 303–06
anthropology
– *see also* comparison, *Geist*, Semites
– in social development 144–45, 156–61, 258–60
– of Semites 86–87, 110–12, 268–72, 309–11
antisemitism/anti-Judaism
– *see also* Catholicism, Judaism
– in Gunkel 242–43, 261, 263–64, 266
– in Imperial Germany 119–120
– in other scholars 48 n. 112, 63 n. 184, 203–04
– in Wellhausen 60, 85 n. 72, 104–09, 291–92, 304–06
apocalyptic 186, 210, 212, 225–31, 241 n. 160, 246, 300
apocrypha 216, 227–28
Arabic
– institutional place 42, 201
– sources 53, 72–73, 76, 106 n. 166, 111–12, 136
Arabs, pre-Islamic
– *see also* Hebrews, Israel/Israelites, Semites
– customs 86–87, 95, 109–19, 269, 294–95, 309, 311
– tribal system 67, 90
Assyria/Assyrians
– *see also* Babylonia/Babylonians, Israel/Israelites, Semites
– as enemy of Israel 4, 94, 101, 103, 153, 294
– cultural influence 102 n. 145, 104, 111–12, 260
assyriology 111, 152, 172, 198–200, 205, 248–49

Babel-Bibel-Streit/Babel–Bible Affair 1–2, 148, 199 n. 110, 288
Babylonia/Babylonians
– *see also* Assyria/Assyrians, Israel/Israelites, Semites
– as enemy of Israel 1–2, 4
– cultural influence 102 n. 145, 104, 111–12, 234, 269
– origin of Jewish material 236–44, 260, 271–72, 289, 298, 299
Baethgen, Friedrich 159 n. 144, 211, 279 n. 141
Barton, George Aaron 199, 236 n. 134
Baudissin, Wolf Wilhelm Graf 41, 42
Baur, Ferdinand Christian 29, 75, 160 n. 146, 190
Becker, Carl Heinrich 9, 72, 294
belief, *see* faith
biblical criticism, *see* criticism
Bildung 55, 115
Bildungsbürgertum/middle classes
– as consumers 5, 15, 23, 169, 173, 198, 251, 285
– interconnection 26–27, 67, 285–86
Bleek, Friedrich 80, 178 n. 31
book series
– *see also* journals, reference works
– *Bibliothek for de tusen hjem* 84 n. 69
– *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments* 251
– *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 168, 251
– *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher für die deutsche christliche Gegenwart* 251, 293
– *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 176
– *The Student's Series* 68
borrowing, *see* diffusion
bourgeois/bourgeoisie, *see Bildungsbürgertum*

Budde, Karl 238 n. 146, 285
Bultmann, Rudolf 253, 280
Burckhardt, Jacob 134–35, 159 n. 143

canonicity
– *see also* scripture
– authority 15, 138
– canonical texts 20, 213–14, 294
– non-canonical texts 198, 212–13, 213–14, 216, 225–31, 233, 246–47
Catholicism
– anti-Catholicism 14–15, 77, 97 n. 127, 112 n. 192, 119–20, 144 n. 84, 308
– scholars 193, 203
– university structure 42
– *vis-à-vis* politics 66 n. 5, 106, 119, 120
chairs
– *see also* faculty, universities
– appointments to 25–45, 45–46, 47–48, 210–13
– reassignments of 40 n. 77, 70 n. 14, 194
Chaoskampf 236–38, 240
– *see also* creation
Cheyne, Thomas Kelly 178, 236 n. 134, 248
Christ, *see* Jesus
Christianity
– *see also* Catholicism, church, Israel/Israelites, Jesus, Judaism, Protestantism, theocracy
– alleged truth of 46, 299, 301
– as religion 195, 287–88, 299, 312
– as syncretistic 203–05, 261
– essence of 56, 177, 205, 301
– *vis-à-vis* culture 66 n. 5
– *vis-à-vis* Israel 2, 108, 119 n. 229, 143–44, 213–25, 277, 293
– *vis-à-vis* Judaism 4, 75, 109, 144 n. 83, 156, 175, 186, 213–25, 308–09
– *vis-à-vis* prophecy 15, 102
chronology
– of Arabic sources 128
– of biblical texts 3, 95, 102 n. 144, 135, 244, 265
– for historical study 144, 152, 155, 205, 232
church
– *see also* Catholicism, Judaism, Protestantism, theocracy
– in Imperial Germany 1, 119–21, 173–74, 251
– Gunkel's stance towards 167, 248, 249, 251, 281–82
– relationship to Judaism 95–109, 237, 292, 304, 308–09
– *vis-à-vis* the state 2, 13–14, 35, 36
– Wellhausen's stance towards 38, 45–56, 161, 163–64
class, *see Bildungsbürgertum*
classics/classical scholarship
– as discipline 129, 199, 200–201
– as trendsetter 26, 45, 76–77, 180, 192, 193 n. 92, 197
– *vis-à-vis* biblical scholarship 139, 184, 189, 249, 261, 282, 295 n. 31
Clemen, Carl 194, 237
Cohen, Hermann 123, 133, 139, 162
comparison
– *see also* anthropology, Semites, typology
– language, grammar 42, 296
– method 109–13, 146–47, 157–59, 180, 182, 232–50, 268–72
– religion 181, 184–92, 192–96, 197–204, 218, 295–96, 298–99
Comte, August/Comteanism 125–26, 131, 144
creation, divine
– of church 120, 161, 308
– of individual 182, 301
– of nation 120, 161, 308
– of world 1, 3, 188, 232–50, 258, 280
credentials, honorary 29–33, 38, 45–46, 47–48, 234 n. 127
criticism
– *see also* history, historicism, interpretation, Pentateuch, positivism
– historical 4, 14, 133–39, 148, 174, 186, 292
– source/literary 3, 135–39, 153–56, 226–27, 238–39, 247–48, 252, 253, 265, 277
– tendency 20, 137, 141 n. 74, 157 n. 139, 179 n. 31
– textual 124, 131, 156, 181–82, 252, 253, 262–63, 265–66, 277
– *vis-à-vis* synthesis 4–5, 79–82, 127 n. 14, 129, 140 n. 73, 141 n. 74, 153–56, 178 n. 31
Cross, Frank Moore 140 n. 73
cult/cultus
– *see also* anti-semitism/anti-Judaism, Catholicism, exile, law
– centralization 3, 101 n. 142
– in Judaism 104–05, 199 n. 113
– pre-Mosaic 102, 114–15, 303–04, 305
– *vis-à-vis* religion 186, 290, 294, 297, 309–10
Curtiss, Samuel Ives 37 n. 56, 112 n. 191, 157 n. 139

de Lagarde, Paul 47–49, 127, 180–84, 203, 210–11
de la Saussaye, Pierre Daniel Chantepie 193–94
de Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht 97, 138, 141 n. 74, 142 n. 79, 144 n. 84, 148 n. 98
Darwin, Charles/Darwinism 23, 84 n. 69, 125–26, 144–45, 147
David, biblical figure
– as psalmist 214 n. 17
– as ruler 3, 66, 92–93, 100, 112, 119 n. 229, 291 n. 22
degrees, *see* credentials
Delitzsch, Friedrich 1, 142, 188, 199 n. 110
Deussen, Paul 203–04
Deuteronomy, biblical book 3, 103 n. 152, 154
dictionaries, *see* reference works
Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, by Gunkel 209–10, 216–25
Diels, Hermann 62, 162–64, 290
Dieterich, Albrecht 189, 201, 249
diffusion
– *see also Babel-Bibel-Streit*/Babel–Bible Affair, monogenesis, polygenesis
– in Israel 153, 171, 271–72, 303
– in scholarship 195–96, 197–204, 268–70
– vs. parallels 146, 234, 260–63, 298
Dillmann, August
– as advocate 33–34, 36, 81
– as scholar 80, 234
– as theologian 45–47, 50–51
documentary hypothesis, *see* criticism, history, Pentateuch
Driver, Samuel Rolles 71, 77, 80 n. 50
du Bois-Reymond, Emil 162–63
Duhm, Bernhard
– as scholar 81, 90 n. 98, 153, 177–78, 300
– as teacher 179, 183–84, 222

Egypt/Egyptians
– circumcision 111, 269
– in biblical narrative 3
– in Hebrew migrations 87–88, 91 n. 99, 92
– origin of Jewish material 260, 298, 299
egyptology 152 n. 114
Eichhorn, Albert 186–87, 214–15
Eißfeldt, Otto 168, 184, 294, 312
encyclop(a)edias, *see* reference works
eschatology
– as research topic 179, 186, 210, 211
– in Judaism 225, 242, 308
– in New Testament 222–23, 229, 230, 236, 308
ethics, *see* morals/morality, prophets/prophecy
exegesis, *see* interpretation
exile/exilic period
– in biblical narrative 4
– in historiography 97–98, 99, 108 n. 174, 117, 229, 242
– *vis-à-vis* cult 102 n. 148, 105
Ewald, Heinrich
– as author 53, 144 n. 84, 175 n. 20
– as chairholder 43, 47, 181
– as teacher 28–29, 33, 65–66, 67, 130, 142, 191, 198
Ezekiel, biblical figure 79 n. 46, 105, 107, 305
Ezra
– biblical figure 4, 107, 305
– book of 4 Ezra, 2 Esdras 212, 226, 227

faculty, philosophy and theology
– *see also* chairs, credentials, universities
– borders 31–32, 40 n. 77, 45
– remit 37–39, 41–42, 45–51, 176, 187, 192–94
faith
– in God 54, 56, 106 n. 166, 156, 224, 308–09
– in history 132, 271, 277, 290
– in Israel 90, 161, 244, 305–06
– in science 24, 123, 292, 314
– Protestant 15, 222, 287–89, 309, 314
– vs. science 5, 203
Falk, Adalbert 34–35, 37
Fleischer, Heinrich Leberecht 187
Formgeschichte, *see* history, of form
Frazer, James George 234

Gattungsgeschichte, *see* history, of genre
Genesis, biblical book 1, 188, 232–50, 258, 261, 269, 274, 280, 301
Geiger, Abraham 189
Geist 143 n. 81, 150, 151–53, 160 n. 146, 257, 277, 299, 314
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang 1, 23, 27, 75, 85, 173, 227, 272
gospel, *see* Jesus
Graecophilia, *see* Greece/Greeks
Graf, Karl Heinrich/Grafianism 71, 78 n. 43, 81, 83 n. 64, 98, 178
Greece/Greeks
– *see also* Rome/Romans

– as classical antiquity 11, 68, 106, 190, 199, 202
– *vis-à-vis* Christian thought 220
– *vis-à-vis* Germans 200, 220, 222, 290
– *vis-à-vis* Semites 124, 261, 295 n. 31
Greek, language 55, 98 n. 130, 128, 136, 233, 255 n. 11
– "Jewish Greek" 76 n. 40
Greßmann, Hugo 189, 253
Gunkel, Hermann 167–283, 285–315

handbooks, *see* reference works
Hardy, Edmund 193
Harnack, Adolf 58, 74, 163, 176–77, 212, 214 n. 17, 224
Haug, Martin 202
heathen/heathenism, *see* pagan/paganism
Hebrew, language 41–42, 76, 175 n. 20, 184, 201, 235
Hebrews
– *see also* Arabs, Israel/Israelites, Semites
– as nation 86–94, 115 n. 204
– *vis-à-vis* Arabs 109–13, 269
– *vis-à-vis* Babylonians 237
– *vis-à-vis* Israelites/Jews 87, 97, 100, 101 n. 142, 104, 108, 115 n. 204, 266
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich/Hegelianism 47, 125–26, 140–47, 48, 151 n. 113, 163 n. 155, 175, 282
Herder, Johann Gottfried 144, 184, 273–81
Herrmann, Wilhelm 139, 162
hermeneutics, *see* interpretation
historical criticism, *see* criticism
historicism
– *see also* criticism, history, Protestantism, positivism
– as epistemology 3, 41, 124–25, 144–47, 149, 175, 194, 292–93, 315
– principles/values 127, 132, 138 n. 65, 140, 205, 263, 287
– dominance/crisis 15–16, 67, 131, 139, 169, 202, 209, 235–36, 285, 298
history
– *see also* criticism, historicism, Israel, law, orality, *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*
– concept of 139–65, 270–71, 287–92
– of composition 3–4, 6, 88, 95–96, 120, 154, 244, 248
– of form 186, 229, 238–44, 253–55, 257–68, 274
– of genre 186, 228, 240–41, 253–55, 257–68, 270, 274, 275, 279 n. 141
– of literature 86, 154–56, 214, 255, 265–67, 273–74
– of tradition 88, 100 n. 142, 110, 117–18, 136, 153–54, 238–50, 254, 261–64, 306
– of transmission 117, 127, 218, 238–43, 248, 254, 262–64
– of religion 81, 88, 196, 255, 267, 274, 286–87, 294–95, 297–99, 302
History of Religion(s) School, *see Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*

idealism
– in Baur 190 n. 84
– in Gunkel 263, 277, 282, 298
– in Wellhausen 132, 144, 147, 149, 151–52, 263, 277
Indo-European 42, 201, 295 n. 31
indology 42,124, 197–98, 201–04
interpretation, biblical
– *see also* criticism, faculty, historicism, history, piety, theology
– competing modalities 8–9, 50, 74, 171–72, 247–48
– rationalism 146, 158 n. 142, 174, 190 n. 84, 218 n. 37, 224–25, 248
– *vis-à-vis* experience 227, 232, 245, 246–47, 255, 272–82, 301–02
Isaiah, biblical figure 103–04, 179, 245, 291 n. 22, 303–04
Islam
– *see also* Arabs, Israel/Israelites, pagan/paganism
– encyclopedia 128, 130
– formative period 75, 109–19, 311
– institutionalization 75, 294–95, 312
– sources 73, 136, 189
– *vis-à-vis* culture 163–64, 294–95, 310 n. 103
– *vis-à-vis* state 19, 113, 308
Israel/Israelites
– *see also* Arabs, Christianity, criticism, Hebrews, Judaism, moral/morality, Moses, pagan/paganism, revelation, Semites
– as ancient nation 68, 86–94, 95–109, 134–36
– distinctiveness 15, 88, 150, 199, 238, 243, 249, 272, 286–87, 289–90
– entanglement with present 2, 15, 112 n. 192, 119, 143 n. 81, 154 n. 125, 158 n. 142, 314–15
– in biblical narrative 3–4
– *vis-à-vis* Moab 87–88, 89, 91–92, 99, 116 n. 204, 158–59, 269

Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte, by Wellhausen
– difference in editions 52 n. 131, 102, 108
– making of 51, 77–85, 97, 126–27, 135–36, 143, 157
– reception 9, 162–64

Jahn, Otto 187
Jastrow, Morris, Jr. 192–93
Jeremiah, biblical figure 97, 304, 307
Jeremias, Alfred 187, 198
Jerusalem 1, 2, 67, 97, 101 n. 142, 102, 104
Jesus
– as historiographic link 229, 266 n. 67, 289–90, 301, 306–08
– as Jewish 74
– as prophet 161–62
– as reconciler 141 n. 74
– as revelation 1, 289–90
– historicity of 74–75, 214, 248, 296 n. 39
– in biblical narrative 4
– in new religion 156 n. 133, 294
– teaching 121, 230, 306–08, 311–12
– veneration of 15, 204
– *vis-à-vis* law 98 n. 132
– *vis-à-vis* Judaism 108–09, 230, 306–08
– *vis-à-vis* the church 56
Jordan, Louis Henry 192–93, 194 n. 98
Josephus 96–97, 106 n. 166
Josiah, biblical figure 4, 104
journals
– *see also* book series, reference works
– *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 95, 193
– *Cosmopolis* 62
– *Deutsch-Evangelisch. Monatsblätter für den gesamten deutschen Protestantismus* 251
– *Deutsche Literaturzeitung für Kritik der Internationalen Wissenschaft* 251
– *Deutsche Rundschau* 251
– *Die Christliche Welt* 251, 252
– *Die Zukunft* 38
– *Frankfurter Zeitung* 251
– *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 62, 162, 251
– *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 53 n. 137, 80, 81, 179 n. 32
– *Kirchliche Gegenwart* 251
– *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* 83
– *Preußische Jahrbücher* 50, 231, 251
– *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* 54, 56 n. 147, 72, 79, 83, 110, 113, 126
– *Tägliche Rundschau* 251
– *The New World* 53 n. 137
– *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 53 n. 137, 176, 212, 251
Judaism
– *see also* antisemitism/anti-Judaism, Israel, Priestly source, theocracy
– divisions 186, 218 n. 39, 220, 228, 294
– historiographic exclusion 203 n. 127, 204 n. 131, 216
– significance 52, 216, 230
– *vis-à-vis* Babylonia 238, 239 n. 148
– *vis-à-vis* Christianity 75, 77, 144 n. 83, 156, 169, 216, 230, 246, 301, 306–09
– *vis-à-vis* Islam 117
– *vis-à-vis* Israel 4, 75, 97–109, 272, 289, 293–94, 301, 304–05
Justi, Ferdinand 44, 123

Kabisch, Richard 226–27
Kaiser (Wilhelm II) 1–2, 35 n. 48, 47, 58, 59 n. 163, 95, 197, 295
Kautzsch, Emil 211–12, 231, 234 n. 127
Kayser, August 71, 80
Kittel, Rudolf 71 n. 19, 196, 279 n. 141
Kuenen, Abraham 53, 70, 71, 79, 85, 178
Kulturkampf 35, 119
Kulturvolk 159 n. 143, 237
– *see also* anthropology, *Naturvolk*
Kultusministerium, also Ministry of Culture 34–36, 37–41, 43, 51, 58, 85, 127, 210–11

Latin, language 30, 98 n. 130, 128, 189, 233
law
– *see also* morals/morality, Moses, Muhammad, psychology, Torah
– among Semites 110 n. 184, 111
– in biblical criticism 4, 67–68, 95–96, 97–98, 101, 135, 141 n. 74, 148, 155, 267
– in biblical narrative 3–4
– in human history 68 n. 11, 132, 146, 162–64, 239–40, 243, 255, 266–67, 277–78, 280
– in Islam 113, 116–17
– in Judaism 105–09, 291–92, 304–07
– in New Testament 214 n. 17
– of Moses 75, 89, 292, 293
– *vis-à-vis* order 66, 90
– *vis-à-vis* prophecy 101–05, 143, 303–04
– *vis-à-vis* religion 91, 95, 151 n. 113
Littmann, Enno 9, 61 n. 171, 128 n. 16, 269, 273 n. 103

Maccabean Revolt 107, 118 n. 224, 292, 305
Marduk 237, 240, 242, 244
Marti, Karl 238 n. 146
Mecca 115, 116, 117
Medina 19, 72, 75, 95, 109, 116, 117
Mesopotamia, *see* Assyria/Assyrians, Babylonia/Babylonians
Meyer, Eduard 232, 234, 239, 241, 268
Ministry of Culture, *see Kultusministerium*
Moab, Moabites 99, 116 n. 204, 158–59, 269
Mommsen, Theodor
– as relative 26, 180
– as scholar 95, 134–35, 162
– in academic politics 31, 36, 38 n. 62
– stance towards theology 53
monogenesis 146, 234, 237, 260, 270–71, 298
– *see also* diffusion, polygenesis
monotheism, also monolatry
– *see also* Islam, Israel/Israelites, pagan/paganism, polytheism, prophets/prophecy
– as command 3
– as development 4, 114–15, 143 n. 81, 159, 160, 272
– in Zoroastrianism 202–03
– *vis-à-vis* politics 19
morals/morality
– *see also* law, monotheism, prophets/prophecy
– as duty/imperative 52, 57–58, 123, 138, 175 n. 16
– in history 149, 159–61, 261
– in society 95, 113, 115, 163–64, 290
– *vis-à-vis* politics 66, 101 n. 142
– *vis-à-vis* prophecy 103, 109, 112, 141 n. 74, 161, 224–25, 272, 301, 303–07
– *vis-à-vis* spirit 220–21
– *vis-à-vis* truth 14, 56, 91, 149
morphology 146, 156, 219–20, 242, 263, 265, 271, 298
– *see also* typology
Moses
– *see also* law, Torah
– as founder of nation 88–92, 96 n. 125, 150, 296 n. 39
– historicity of 88, 98 n. 132, 100 n. 142
– in biblical narrative 3
– like Muhammad 86 n. 79
– *vis-à-vis* religion 159 n. 144, 266, 304
– *vis-à-vis* revelation 1–2
Mowinckel, Sigmund 253
Muhammad
– as founder of religion 294, 311, 312
– as statesman 67, 75, 95, 115–18
– like Moses 86 n. 79
Müller, Karl Otfried 180
Müller, Max 62
myth
– *see also* Panbabylonianism
– Babylonian 198–99, 232–50, 258, 269, 298
– in Bible 138
– in classics 200
– Germanic 188, 204
– Israelite 91 n. 101, 232–50, 262–63
– *vis-à-vis* cult 310
– *vis-à-vis* religion 195, 295–96, 297

Naturvolk 204 n. 131, 237
– *see also* anthropology, *Kulturvolk*
Nietzsche, Friedrich 200, 203
Nöldeke, Theodor
– as Ewald student 67
– as scholar 10, 44, 72, 89, 128 n. 16, 175 n. 20, 296
Nowack, Wilhelm 212

Oldenberg, Hermann 202
Olshausen, Justus 35–36, 38, 40, 46, 53, 82, 175 n. 20
orality 227, 240, 241, 256 n. 15, 259, 262, 263–67, 274
Overbeck, Franz 47–49

pagan/paganism, also heathen/heathenism
– *see also* monotheism, morals/morality, polytheism
– as ethnic/folk religion 86 n. 79, 111, 311
– as non-rational 151, 158–61
– *vis-à-vis* Christianity 106 n. 165, 224, 292
– *vis-à-vis* Islam 75, 113–16, 118
– *vis-à-vis* Judaism 199–200
– *vis-à-vis* morality 158–61
– *vis-à-vis* prophecy 103, 143
Panbabylonianism 198–200, 269
Paul, biblical figure 97, 98 n. 130, 98 n. 132, 179, 214 n. 17, 216–25
Pentateuch 75, 88, 100, 136 n. 55, 154–56, 245, 297
– *see also* criticism, history, Torah
periodicals, *see* journals
Persia/Persians
– as empire 4, 67, 102 n. 145, 106, 109
– influence on Jews 203, 260, 298
Pfleiderer, Otto 35, 53, 202, 287–88

Pharisees 107–08, 118–19, 156, 230, 266 n. 67, 305, 307
philhellenism, *see* Greece/Greeks
piety
– *see also* interpretation, morals/morality, Protestantism
– in Bible 154, 277, 283, 302
– in Christianity 221, 277
– in Islam 118, 311
– in Judaism 102, 228, 231, 266, 305, 307
– in scholarship 224, 244, 255, 277, 282–83, 302
– of ancient authors 255, 276–78, 282–83, 301–02, 307–08
– *vis-à-vis* community 90, 304, 310 n. 103
– *vis-à-vis* cult 305
– *vis-à-vis* religion 75, 186, 268, 277, 280, 302, 310
polygenesis 146, 237, 270–71
– *see also* comparison, diffusion, monogenesis
polytheism 114–15, 203 n. 127, 240
– *see also* monotheism, pagan/paganism
positivism 126–33, 139, 140 n. 73, 144–46, 150, 235–36, 285, 313–14
priests
– *see also* antisemitism/anti-Judaism, Catholicism, Judaism
– anti-clericalism 112 n. 192, 144 n. 84
– as dominators 99, 119, 266, 304
– *vis-à-vis* prophets 102, 104–09
Priestly source, P
– dating 76, 297
– historiography 81, 96 n. 125, 101 n. 142, 102
– identification as Jewish 109 n. 180, 245, 266 n. 67
professorship, *see* chairs
Prolegomena to the History of Israel, also *Geschichte Israels* (Vol. 1), by Wellhausen
– difference in editions 81 n. 55, 98 n. 132, 127 n. 14, 141 n. 74, 147 n. 95, 155 n. 128, 159 n. 143, 294 n. 26, 295 n. 31
– making of 71, 77–85, 95–98, 101, 126–27, 130, 135–36, 293–94
– reception 9, 54, 71–72, 75, 77
prophets/prophecy
– *see also* Ezra, Jesus, law, monotheism, morals/morality, Moses, Muhammad, Zoroaster
– as distinct period 81, 102, 160, 203 n. 127, 238, 245
– concept of history 161–62, 291, 306
– of the people 245, 266
– type of religion 90 n. 98, 113, 158 n. 142, 294, 303–04
– *vis-à-vis* divine revelation 289–90
– *vis-à-vis* ecstasy 222, 277, 300–01
– *vis-à-vis* law 101–09
– *vis-à-vis* monotheism 159–61
– *vis-à-vis* morality 100 n. 142, 112, 224–25, 263, 272, 312
– *vis-à-vis* national character 150–51
Protestantism
– *see also* Catholicism, church, faculty, interpretation, Judaism, piety, secular/secularization
– divisions 34, 53, 74, 151 n. 113, 174, 177, 288
– in culture 5, 27, 174 n. 15, 251, 272–73, 285
– in scholarship 6, 7, 63, 251, 286–87, 292–93, 313–14
– in Prussia 5, 41, 49–50, 119–20, 313–14
– Protestantization 13–15, 286–87, 292–93
– *vis-à-vis* Jesus 98 n. 132
– *vis-à-vis* Paul 224
Prussia, Prussian 1, 31, 40, 41
psalms
– dating 203 n. 127, 214 n. 17
– genre 264, 279 n. 141
– linking to Christianity 1, 251, 266 n. 67, 283, 289, 300, 301
– textual difficulty 127 n. 15, 243 n. 172
pseudepigrapha 212, 227–28
psychology
– in biblical interpretation 224–25, 247, 274–81, 300
– laws 146, 255, 271, 288
– *vis-à-vis* ethnology 187,194, 259
publishers
– Mohr 293
– Reimer 82, 126
– Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 211, 279 n. 141

Quellenkritik, *see* criticism
Quran 44, 75, 76, 77, 116–18, 189

rabbis 97 n. 127, 112 n. 192, 291–92, 307
Rade, Martin 177, 182 n. 48
Rahlfs, Alfred 127, 181 n. 42, 183 n. 50, 184, 211
reference works
– *see also* book series, journals
– *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* 212, 231

– *Die Kultur der Gegenwart* 180 n. 40
– *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 182 n. 48, 253, 293
– *Encyclopædia Britannica* 61, 127 n. 14
– *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften* 187
– *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament* 212, 264 n. 55, 279 n. 141
– *Kommentar zum Alten Testament* 279 n. 141
– *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes* 228
– *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* 181
– *Pauly(-Wissowa)/Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft* 191
– *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 30
– *Quellen der Religionsgeschichte* 62
– *Sacred Books of the East* 62
– *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 30
Reitzenstein, Richard 201
religion, *see* comparison, cult, history, law, morals/morality, prophets/prophecy, piety, theology, *Wissenschaft*
Religionsgeschichtliche Schule, of Göttingen 177, 184–92, 192–96, 197–204, 214, 245, 296
revelation, divine
– in Bible 1–2, 5, 245
– in experience 219, 224–25
– in history 1–2, 138–39, 149 n. 104, 161–62, 208, 244, 287–92
Reuß, Eduard 71, 79 n. 46, 83, 184
Ritschl, Albrecht
– as advocate 36
– as teacher 29, 174–75, 178 n. 30, 183, 196, 215
– as theologian 174, 182, 183, 185–86, 229, 278 n. 138
ritual 15, 102 n. 148, 143, 203 n. 127
Rome/Romans
– *see also* Greece/Greek, Latin
– as classical antiquity 11, 68, 102 n. 145, 190, 199, 202, 203, 290
– as empire 4, 106, 108–09, 295, 308
romantic/romanticism 44, 57, 124, 144, 192, 197, 224–25, 256 n. 15, 257, 263
– anti-romantic 57, 285, 298
– neo-romantic 16, 277 n. 128, 298
– post-romantic 57, 132, 236
Royal Society of the Sciences, *see* Academy of the Sciences
sacrifice 6, 114, 156, 295, 310, 311
Schlegel, August Wilhelm 190
Schleiermacher, Friedrich 174 n. 15, 175 n. 16, 280–82, 292, 302
scholarship, *see Wissenschaft*
Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, by Gunkel 188, 212, 232–50, 257, 260, 299–300
Schrader, Eberhard 34, 198, 233 n. 124
Schwartz, Eduard
– as biographer 19, 25–27, 38, 59 n. 163, 65–67, 312
– as scholar 139, 140, 295 n. 31
science, *see Wissenschaft*
scripture
– *see also* canonicity, criticism
– as object of study 21, 32, 41–42, 52, 139, 167, 285
– as source 2–3, 6, 101 n. 142, 293
– non-biblical 191
– veneration of 251–52
– vs. experience 174, 221–22, 246–47
secular/secularization
– in scholarship 194–95, 303
– *vis-à-vis* the religious 13–15, 55–56, 96–97, 103 n. 150, 116–17
Semites
– *see also* Arabs, comparison, Hebrews, Israel/Israelites
– as a class 72, 91, 109–15, 129, 156–58, 202, 218, 269, 298, 309–11
– as realist 124, 204
– *vis-à-vis* the Greeks 202, 203, 295 n. 31
series, *see* book series
Seydel, Rudolf 187, 202
Sitz im Leben 240–41, 254, 260
Smend, Rudolf (Sr.) 27, 42, 43–44, 184, 232, 235
Smith, William Robertson
– as friend of Wellhausen 52, 53, 55, 83 n. 63
– as Old Testament scholar 77 n. 42, 292
– as semitist 61, 72, 79 n. 47, 86, 129, 134, 295, 309–11
societies/associations
– *see also* Academy of the Sciences
– Academic-Theological Association 179, 215
– American Oriental Society 23 n. 2, 31 n. 28, 61
– Church History Society 176
– *Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* (German Oriental Society) 39, 62

– *Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft* (German Oriental Society) 1
– German Protestant Association 187
– International Congress of Orientalists 60–61
– *Pour le Mérite für Wissenschaften und Künste* 58 n. 159, 59, 133
– Protestant-Lutheran Association in the Province of Hanover 174
– Prussian Royal Order of the Crown 59
– Society of Biblical Literature 23 n. 2, 61, 207, 254
spirit
– *see also Geist*
– of epochs 153–54, 229, 265, 267
– of individuals 163, 207–08, 226, 227, 229, 255
– of peoples 150–54, 159, 267, 274, 313
– in Judaism/Christianity 217–25
– objectification of 131–32, 153
Stade, Bernhard
– as theologian 32, 45–47, 49, 50–51
– as teacher 176, 179 n. 34, 253
– as scholar 62 n. 182, 71, 81 n. 55, 175–76, 253, 295, 298
Stift
– in Göttingen 28, 34, 65, 174, 175, 177
– in Tübingen 46, 191
Strauß, David Friedrich 75, 142, 190

theocracy, also hierarchy, hierocracy 56, 75, 77, 90 n. 96, 95–109, 117–19, 143, 308
theology
– *see also* chairs, faculty, Protestantism, *Stift*, *Wissenschaft*
– as subject/discipline 26, 28–29, 37–39, 42, 45–54, 102 n. 145, 174, 185–86, 210–11, 249
– *vis-à-vis* religious studies 192–96
Torah
– *see also* cult, law, Moses, Pentateuch, theocracy
– as constitution 99, 105
– in Judaism 105 n. 158, 107, 109, 292
– *vis-à-vis* Moses 88, 91 n. 99, 102 n. 148
Toy, Crawford Howell 199
Traditionsgeschichte, *see* history, of tradition
translation 7–8, 77 n. 41, 190 n. 79, 229 n. 104, 272, 273 n. 103
Troeltsch, Ernst 33 n. 36, 182, 185, 214
Tylor, Edward Burnett 259
typology 218, 263, 264–67, 269, 271
– *see also* morphology

Umayyads 73, 118
Überlieferungsgeschichte, *see* history, of transmission
universities
– *see also* chairs, credentials, faculty, *Stift*
– relative standing 37, 39–40
– Berlin 31, 40, 47, 63, 134, 193, 201
– Bonn 188–90, 194, 201
– Cambridge 33, 58, 61
– Edinburgh 33, 58, 95
– Giessen 32 n. 33, 46, 51 n. 124, 174–79
– Göttingen 28–30, 31, 42, 43, 47, 59–60, 174, 179–80, 183–84, 185–86
– Greifswald 29–30, 32, 33, 35–36, 38, 58, 179, 211
– Halle 31, 37–38, 43, 47, 62, 187, 211–13
– Heidelberg 43
– Leipzig 44, 46, 47, 187–90
– Oxford 61
– St. Andrews 48
– Tübingen 29, 45, 175, 190–91
Usener, Hermann 52, 139, 179, 189, 200–01

Vatke, Wilhelm
– as biblical critic 71, 76 n. 40
– as hero of Wellhausen 79, 96, 98, 134 n. 44
– as influence on Wellhausen 86 n. 79, 140, 141–43, 144 n. 84
von Bismarck, Otto 34–35, 66–67, 68 n. 11, 93 n. 110, 119 n. 229
von Helmholtz, Hermann 162
von Roth, Rudolf 191
von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich
– as biographer 26, 27–28, 34, 37–38, 54
– as friend of Wellhausen 43–44, 52
– as influenced by Wellhausen 76 n. 40, 139
– as teacher of Gunkel 180
– in upper echelons 26, 35, 63, 200–01

war
– in antiquity 86–87, 92–93, 99, 117, 128, 242
– in modernity 65–66, 121 n. 232, 173
Weber, Max 151 n. 113, 199
Weiß, Johannes 210, 214, 230
Welcker, Friedrich Gottlieb 188–89
Wellhausen, Julius 19–165, 285–315
Wilhelm II, *see* Kaiser
Winckler, Hugo 38, 198
Wissenschaft
– *see also* criticism, historicism, history, positivism, Protestantism

– as imperative/duty 57, 307
– confidence in 5, 24
– construction of 14–15, 124–25, 132, 195
– types of 164
– vs. religion 2, 280
– *vis-à-vis* theology 45–51, 288–89

Wrede, William 179, 214, 215, 232, 299–300
Wundt, Wilhelm 187, 259

Zeller, Eduard 190
Zimmern, Heinrich 188, 234, 248
Zöckler, Otto 34, 187 n. 67, 227–29
Zoroaster 202–03